Seton Hall University
eRepository @ Seton Hall

Seton Hall University Dissertations and Theses (ETDs)

Seton Hall University Dissertations and Theses

2005

A Study of the Criteria Used to Select Teachers by New Jersey Elementary School Principals Based on the Socioeconomic Status of the Hiring District

Edward J. Forsthoffer III

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations

 Part of the Educational Administration and Supervision Commons

Recommended Citation

Forsthoffer III, Edward J., "A Study of the Criteria Used to Select Teachers by New Jersey Elementary School Principals Based on the Socioeconomic Status of the Hiring District" (2005). *Seton Hall University Dissertations and Theses (ETDs)*. 147.
https://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations/147

A STUDY OF THE CRITERIA USED TO SELECT TEACHERS BY NEW JERSEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS BASED ON THE SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS OF THE HIRING DISTRICT

BY

EDWARD J. FORSTHOFFER, III

Dissertation Committee

Joseph Stetar, Ph.D., Mentor
John W. Collins, Jr., Ed.D.
Ralph P. Ferrie, Ed.D.
Michael A. Rossi, Jr., Ph.D.

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education
Seton Hall University

MARCH 2005

ABSTRACT

A Study of the Criteria Used to Select Teachers by New Jersey Elementary School Principals Based on the Socioeconomic Status of the Hiring District

Edward J. Forsthoffer, III

The purpose of this study was to describe various teacher-selection criteria that are used by elementary school principals in New Jersey and then analyze them based on the socioeconomic status of the school district to investigate similarities and differences that may exist. This research examined which teacher qualities principals rate as important when hiring teachers and then investigated whether differences existed dependent upon the socioeconomics of the principals' school district. Hiring practices were also examined based on the SES of the principals' school district. Finally, principals' self-perceptions of their hiring practices and their effectiveness were also examined.

This research supported previous research with respect to which teacher selection criteria are important. The research also revealed some significant differences in the teacher selection criteria used by principals based on the socioeconomic status of their school district.

A STUDY OF THE CRITERIA USED TO SELECT TEACHERS BY NEW JERSEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS BASED ON THE SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS OF THE HIRING DISTRICT

BY

EDWARD J. FORSTHOFFER, III

Dissertation Committee

Joseph Stetar, Ph.D., Mentor
John W. Collins, Jr., Ed.D.
Ralph P. Ferrie, Ed.D.
Michael A. Rossi, Jr., Ph.D.

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education
Seton Hall University

MARCH 2005

© Copyright by Edward J. Forsthoffer, III, 2005
All Rights Reserved

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

One of the primary tenets of a doctoral dissertation is that it must be an original work of the doctoral candidate. Although this work is my work, there are a number of people who have assisted me in this process and, without them, this project would never have been completed.

First and foremost, I must thank my mentor, Dr. Joseph Stetar. Dr. Stetar inherited me after my original mentor left the university early in my coursework. He treated me as if I was one of his original candidates and somehow found the perfect balance of providing me direction while allowing me the freedom to find my way. His mark is definitely found in this dissertation.

Dr. John Collins, Jr. has been a source of awe since my second course at Seton Hall. He understands statistics with an ease that I will never experience. Dr. Collins' easygoing manner and sharp sense of humor helped to create an environment that was conducive for study. I will always think of him with WPR.

Dr. Ralph Ferrie first planted the seed of Seton Hall five years before I started. At that time I was a new, inexperienced vice principal and he saw something in me that made him feel I could handle the rigor of the program. It took me five years to heed his advice but there is no

doubt in my mind that he is the reason I attended this program.

Dr. Michael Rossi has become a friend and a colleague of mine over the last two years. An alumni of SHU, he is the perfect role model of a life-long learner. Dr. Rossi has become my cheerleader during this process and the person I was able to connect with when the times were tough. I look forward to a long professional and personal relationship with this leader.

My compatriots of Cohort VII have been an unending source inspiration. When I look around the room at these educational leaders I feel confident about the future of education in this country.

Thomas Smith lives just a few miles from my house yet it took Seton Hall for our paths to cross. Tom is SuperDad, SuperAdministrator, and will no doubt be Superintendent whenever he is ready to accept the challenge. I've enjoyed the stimulating car rides to and from the university and look forward to a long friendship that includes in depth discussions of topics heard on NPR.

Doreen Ryan is another new and close friend I have met at Seton Hall. She has become my IM buddy and I always enjoy our "academic" discussions across the Internet. I will continue to be amazed how she can turn a brief

discussion and ten minutes time into a full-fledged PowerPoint presentation. Doreen has become a lifelong friend and I can only hope that one day she, Tom and I will all work together.

Finally, my friends and family have provided me the strength I needed. Their understanding of the time I needed to take away from them and their celebration of each milestone I accomplished along the way have made this time pass quickly. I am fortunate to have so many caring people in my life.

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to my family.

My mother was the first person in our family to attend and complete college. I clearly remember her studying at the kitchen table and completing assignments while the rest of the family played. Both of my parents instilled that love and dedication for learning and worked to put their four children through college. I told my parents, when I was six years old, that I was going to be a doctor. And now, 34 years later, I am keeping that promise. Dad, I wish that you were here with me to see this through, but in many ways, it feels like you never left.

My wife Michele, and my children Eddie and Brielle have been unselfish in the time they have given me. Allowing me to work, keeping the house quiet, putting up with weekends away at Seton Hall or the library, and most importantly, *doing the grocery shopping*, made it possible for me to complete this stage of my (our) life. Thank you for the confidence you have had in me and all of the love and support you have given me along the way.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Monitoring and evaluating teachers, for their effectiveness and improvement, is a primary task of school principals (Glickman, 1990). To help ensure success in this endeavor it is extremely important that school administrators hire competent teachers who are best able to achieve success in the school setting. In New Jersey, there is no uniform procedure for interviewing, selecting, and ultimately hiring new teachers. School districts across New Jersey have developed many methods and techniques for predicting the success of their future employees. Different school districts develop procedures that allow for the selection of teachers that best fit each individual district's needs.

Different districts have different needs. However, if similarities exist among the districts, are there similarities in the teacher selection criteria for those districts? Do different districts necessarily develop different selection criteria simply because they are developed independently?

Statement of the Problem

Selecting quality teachers and retaining them in the schools is a national dilemma. The Education Commission of the States (as cited in Allen, 2002) lists concerns about teacher quality as one of the most important education policies facing our country. Concerns about teacher quality were discussed in 46 governor's State of the State addresses and 162 bills regarding teacher quality were signed into law in 2001 (Allen, 2002).

When the need to hire a new teacher arises, the question as to whether the person is being hired simply because a position became available or if this opening is being seen as an opportunity to improve the school needs to be answered.

New Jersey has no standard criteria for hiring teachers, which means each of the more than 600 school districts in the state are able to develop their own set of criteria for determining which teachers are a best match for the district. This study will investigate the different criteria used by elementary school principals and school leaders and determine if the criteria is different based on the district's socio-economic status. The surveyed school leaders will be a representative sample of New Jersey elementary schools. This study will be a cross-

sectional study in that principals and administrators will be surveyed by questionnaire to determine which interviewing criteria the various school leaders are using. More specifically, this investigation will compare the questionnaire responses of this representative group for differences and similarities among poorer New Jersey schools (defined as having a District Factor Group (DFG) or label of A, B, or CD) and more affluent New Jersey schools (defined as having a DFG label of GH, I, or J). The results of these surveys will be analyzed for any differences that exist, if any, of the criteria used for hiring new teachers based on the socioeconomic status/DFG of the district.

The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to describe various teacher-selection criteria that are used by elementary school principals in New Jersey. The criteria will then be analyzed based on the socioeconomic status of the district to investigate similarities and differences that may exist. Data will be collected through the use of a survey. Poorer districts will be identified as having a DFG of A, B, or CD and wealthier districts will be defined as having a DFG of GH, I, or J. In this research the teacher interviewing criteria will be defined as questions, techniques, and

instruments that are used to select candidates for employment as teachers. Districts may benefit by studying what districts with differing socioeconomic status are doing in the area of teacher interviewing.

Significance of the Study

Between 1998 and 2008 more than 2 million new teachers will be needed (Darling-Hammond, 2000). Finding and hiring quality teachers will be one of the most important tasks facing principals. This study will examine the hiring practices of principals in New Jersey. Since there has been little research on selection issues based on varying socioeconomic status (SES) in school districts (Westbrook, 1998), this study will focus on those similarities and differences. Effective similarities between high SES districts and low SES districts will contribute to the body of knowledge on hiring practices. If differences exist between these two groups of districts, questions will arise as to why hiring techniques are different, what the reasons are for these differences, and if districts benefit by examining the hiring practices of districts in the other group.

It is probable that different school districts have some similar problems that they share with each other and it is also possible that there are some problems that all

districts do not share. Examining districts based on their socioeconomic level will contribute to the body of knowledge on hiring practices in educational administration. Certainly, if principals evaluate the teacher qualities they find most desirable, there will be some common qualities regardless of the socioeconomic status of the district. But what if there are differences? If some qualities are more desired by principals in lower SES school districts than by principals in the higher SES school districts, this would create some questions. Why these differences exist may be important to examine in the future. Colleges, universities and teacher preparation programs would benefit from this information by better matching their students to districts that covet the skills they bring with them.

Colleges and universities have introduced courses to focus education "on preparing students for the increasingly interdependent (economically, technologically, politically, ecologically, and so on) world and diverse (multicultural, multiracial, multinational, and so on) societies they will graduate into" (Mazurek, Winzer, & Majorek, 2000, p. 1). If colleges are preparing students and teaching them by comparing cultures from around the world, these same benefits may be realized if they were taught about

neighboring school districts with different economic levels.

Principals would benefit from the knowledge of what is desired and working in neighboring districts. This knowledge would allow them to be innovative in their thinking instead of locked into the practices that are inherent in the group their district belongs. But if principals remain entrenched in their practices, students of education would benefit by being better able to match their skills to the districts that would most desire them.

Research Questions

1. Which teacher candidate qualities do New Jersey elementary school principals rate as most important?
2. What relationship exists between the teacher candidate qualities desired by New Jersey elementary school principals in higher socio-economic districts and New Jersey elementary school principals in lower socio-economic districts?
    a. How significantly do principals rate the personal traits of teacher candidates based on the socioeconomic status of the school district in which they work?

b. How significantly do principals view the educational background of teacher candidates based on the socioeconomic status of the school district in which they work?

c. How significantly do principals view the perceived intelligence of teacher candidates based on the socioeconomic status of the school district in which they work?

d. How significantly do principals view the professional relationships of teacher candidates based on the socioeconomic status of the school district in which they work?

e. How significantly do principals view the teacher candidate's knowledge of various instructional methods based on the socioeconomic status of the school district in which they work?

3. What relationship exists between the hiring practices of New Jersey elementary school principals in higher socio-economic districts and New Jersey elementary school principals in lower socio-economic districts?

4. What opinion do principals have of their own hiring practices based on the socioeconomic status of the school district in which they work?

Definitions of the Terms

Principal: A person having the chief authority or responsibility (Cayne, 1989). For this study the school principal will be the chief administrator of an elementary school who is responsible for the interviewing and the hiring of new teachers.

District Factor Group (DFG): Created in 1975 by the New Jersey Department of education, the DFG was developed as an equitable method for reporting test scores. Comparisons are made between districts based on their socioeconomic status as described by seven criteria rather than the geographical differences (New Jersey Department of Education, 2003a). 575 of New Jersey's public school districts have been assigned DFG's ranging from A (lowest SES) to J (highest SES)(New Jersey Department of Education, 2003b).

Elementary School: A school for young children; usually the first 6 to 8 grades (WordNet, 2001). For the purpose of this study, any school that contains grades beginning with pre-kindergarten and no greater than grade five is considered an elementary school. Schools that contain grades six or higher are excluded from this study.

Teacher Selection: Jensen (1987) states, "The quality of any school district depends more upon the quality of its

staff than upon any other factor. Each time a teacher is hired, the local school and its district have an opportunity to improve instructional programs" (p. 5). Selecting new teachers for a school is one of the most critical responsibilities facing a principal, because the quality of the teachers in the building largely determines the quality of the school and the programs offered (Jensen, 1987). For the purpose of this study, teacher selection is the process used by a principal for the purpose of hiring a candidate for a teaching position.

Teacher Interview: The interview process consists of a set of established procedures and questions that are asked of candidates that are both appropriate and substantial (Gagnon, 2003). The interview is the part of the teacher selection process where the prospective teaching candidate actually meets with the principal or school leader to answer questions for the purpose of being hired by the interviewer.

Teacher Candidate Qualities: Teacher candidate qualities and hiring practices used to evaluate the prospective teacher.

Personal Traits: Qualities that a person possesses that refer to the way in which he or she interacts with the

world (NextStep.org, 2004). For the purpose of this study these interactions would occur in the school.

Educational Background: Sum of knowledge, both intellectual and practical, acquired in a teaching establishment or individually (International Index and Dictionary of Rehabilitation and Social Integration, 2005). A written record or the experience that a teacher candidate possesses.

Perceived Intelligence: Intelligence can be defined as "the ability to perceive logical relationship and use one's knowledge to solve problems and respond appropriately to novel situations" (Cayne, 1989, p. 502). It is obviously difficult to measure intelligence, especially in the context of an employment interview. Principals can only perceive the intelligence during this brief time used for the interview. Principals may use the degrees that a teacher candidate possesses coupled with the expertise expressed by the candidate to perceived the intelligence of the teacher candidate.

Professional Relationships: The degree to which a teacher candidate is able to interact with colleagues, students, and parents. Cayne (1989) defines relationship as "the mutual exchange between two people or groups who have dealings with one another" (p. 841). For the purposes

of this study, professional relationships will be the mutual exchanges that take place between the teacher and the various constituencies at school.

Instructional Methods: Marzano (2003) states that "a teacher-level factor that affects students achievement is instructional strategies" (p. 78). For the purposes of this research, instructional strategies and instructional methods will be used synonymously. Instructional methods will be the various ways in which instruction is delivered to the students.

Hiring Practices: Methods used by the principal for the selection of new teachers.

Limitations and Delimitations

This study is being conducted through mailed surveys and return mail responses. This procedure will cause some limitations. The response rate will need to be monitored carefully because a 100 percent return rate is not expected. Since the survey will be completed by individuals regarding their own practices in hiring teachers, there is the possibility that respondents will not complete the survey accurately, even with the promise of confidentiality.

This study will only concentrate on hiring practices in public, elementary schools in the state of New Jersey.

The study will not focus on the hiring practices of intermediate schools, middle schools, high schools, or non-public schools.

Chapter II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

Sergiovanni (1996) laments that very often school leaders make decisions based on what always has been done rather than identifying the problem first and then finding a solution to solve the problem.

> Form should follow function. School decisions should be based on what we believe is good, and on what we know is effective for enhancing student academic, social, and moral development. But too often our imported theories of schooling provide us with ready-made forms for organizing, developing curriculum, planning for teaching and learning, providing for teacher development, and for making other school decisions. With form already in place, our job is then to figure out how we can craft goals and develop strategies that fit. Function follows form (p. 119).

This has been a problem with teacher selection. When the need to hire a new teacher arises, the question as to whether the person is being hired simply because a position

became available or if this opening is being seen as an opportunity to improve the school needs to be answered.

In studying the literature on teacher selection there are a number of areas that warrant attention. This chapter will first explore why teacher selection is important. This section will examine the need there will be in the near future for teacher selection and what school leaders are looking at when selecting teachers. Following this section will be a review of the research on effective teaching. This research will be instrumental in developing the survey instrument used in this research. Next, research on effective hiring practices outside of education will be investigated. This information will also be included in the survey instrument for investigating interviewing procedures. Teacher recruitment strategies will be examined next and then research on the methods of teacher selection. Finally, an examination of socioeconomic status will be used for its impact on teacher selection in New Jersey.

Importance of Teacher Selection

In 2001-2002 there were approximately 3 million public school teachers in the United States teaching approximately 47.7 million public school students. (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2002). Kantrowitz and Wingert's

research (as cited in Stevens, 2001) states that of these 3 million teachers approximately 1 million veteran teachers will be ready to retire between 1998 and 2008, and more than 2 million new teachers will be needed (Darling-Hammond, 2000). This turnover will be due to the large number of retirements along with huge enrollment increases and the alarming rate of attrition in American schools (National Commission on Teaching America's Future, 1996). The next ten years in American education will be tumultuous for school districts as they attempt to fill their schools with quality teachers.

Hiring quality teachers must be one of the most important tasks of principals and school decision makers. Protheroe, Lewis, and Paik (2002) state that "Educators, students, and parents agree. It takes high quality teachers to ensure that students receive a solid education" (p. 1).

Selecting quality teachers and retaining them in the schools is a national dilemma. The Education Commission of the States (as cited in Allen, 2002) lists concerns about teacher quality as one of the most important education policies facing our country. Concerns about teacher quality were discussed in 46 governor's State of the State

addresses and 162 bills regarding teacher quality were signed into law in 2001 (Allen, 2002).

The number of new teachers needed in a short span of time appears impossible to attain. Ingersoll (1994) describes a number of studies that focused attention on the teacher shortages throughout the 1980's. He states that these studies came as a complete surprise because they followed a span of time when teachers were plentiful. After examining statistics from the Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS) conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) his analysis suggests that there is no shortage in the availability of schoolteachers. However, the same research indicates that teacher quality is the real issue. Schools are able to fill their teacher openings but teachers are unqualified (Ingersoll, 1994; Ingersoll & Smith, 2003)

Whether teacher shortages are the result of the quantity of teachers or the quality of teachers, principals want the most qualified and effective teacher in their buildings. There has been much research on what makes an effective teacher. The question will be if principals use this information to select high quality teachers for their schools.

Effective Teachers

Marzano, (2003) collated the available research on effective teaching and then devised a list of characteristics of an effective teacher. Wright, Horn, and Sanders (as cited by Marzano, 2003) note that

> the most important factor affecting student learning is the teacher: In addition, the results show wide variation in effectiveness among teachers. The immediate and clear implications of this finding is that seemingly more can be done to improve education by improving the effectiveness of teachers than by any other single factor. Effective teachers appear to be effective with students of all achievement levels regardless of the levels of heterogeneity in their classes [emphasis in original]. If the teacher is ineffective, students under that teacher's tutelage will achieve inadequate progress academically, regardless of how similar or different they are regarding their academic achievement. (p. 72)

Marzano measured teacher effectiveness as the ability to explore instructional strategies, classroom management, and classroom curriculum design. He proposed that the existing 3 million teachers in the United States are most likely distributed normally along a bell curve in regards

to teacher effectiveness (Marzano, 2003). Based on this information, principals and school leaders will want to work even more diligently to hire only effective teachers so that the curve becomes more skewed in the positive direction.

Traina (1999) used a qualitative search of 19th and 20th century autobiographies of 125 prominent Americans. In examining the autobiographies, he searched for descriptions that these leaders gave of their most admired teachers. Traina found that the leaders consistently stated that their most admired teachers had a command of the subject matter, a deep and caring concern for the students, and a distinctive style of teaching.

McEwan (2002) feels that the success of a school "depends, in large measure, on the quality of the teaching staff. When teachers are effective, students learn. When teachers are skilled, parents are happy. When teachers look good, their principals also look good." (p. xi). McEwan describes ten traits of effective teachers that fall into three categories.

Personal Traits That Signify Character: What the Effective Teacher Is.

Trait 1: Mission-Driven and Passionate (feeling a "call" to teach as well as a passion to help students learn and grow)

Trait 2: Positive and Real (demonstrating the qualities of caring, empathy, respect, and fairness in relationships with students, parents, and colleagues.)

Trait 3; A Teacher-Leader (who positively affects the lives of students, parents, and colleagues)

Teaching Traits That Get Results: What the Effective Teacher Does

Trait 4: With-It-Ness (the state of being on top of, tuned in to, aware of, and in complete control of three critical facets of classroom life:

1. The management and organization of the classroom
2. The engagement of students
3. The management of time

Trait 5: Style (exhibits a personal unique style, bringing drama, enthusiasm, liveliness, humor, charisma, creativity/ and novelty to teaching)

Trait 6: Motivational Expertise (a motivator par excellence who believes in his or her own ability to make a difference in the lives of students and relentlessly presses and pursues students to maintain

the highest possible behavioral and academic expectations.)

Trait 7: Instructional Effectiveness (a skilled communicator with a repertoire of essential abilities, behaviors, models, and principles that lead all students to learning)

Intellectual Traits That Demonstrate Knowledge, Curiosity, and Awareness: What and How an Effective Teacher Thinks:

Trait 8: Book Learning (has a sound knowledge of content (the structure of the discipline) and outcomes (what the school, district, or state has determined is essential for students to know).

Trait 9: Street Smarts (has knowledge of the students/ the school, and the community in which that teacher is teaching and uses this knowledge to solve problems in the instructional setting.)

Trait 10: A Mental Life (has a substantive thought life that includes the abilities to be the following:

1. Metacognitive: able to read one's own mental state and then assess how that state will affect one's present and future performance
2. Strategic: able to think aloud and model strategic learning for students

3. Reflective: able to think about personal teaching behaviors for the purposes of self-growth
4. Communicative: able to articulate ideas, issues, beliefs, and values about the act of teaching with colleagues, students, and parents
5. Responsive: able to "flex" to the changing needs and demands of the profession (McEwan, 2002, pp. 9-21)

Borich (1993) identified six characteristics of effective teachers, many of which align with the personal traits identified by McEwan. The six identified characteristics were:

1. Teachers who believe in themselves discover a purpose for teaching that is greater than presenting only course content.
2. The concepts of success and failure do not exist, at least not in their professional lives.
3. They know what they value and focus their behavior outwardly on those values.
4. They take joy in creating, innovating, and changing. They play at teaching in unconventional ways.
5. They are long-term planners and thinkers.

6. The importance successful teachers place on their relationships with others (pp. 109-124).

Stronge (2002) also examined the qualities of effective teaching. After examining over 50 programs related to teacher effectiveness, Stronge defines effective teaching as "a combination of many factors, including aspects of the teacher's background and ways of interacting with others, as well as specific teaching practices" (p.61).

Stronge (2002) states that research has identified five areas that will improve student performance. He cites numerous research studies that indicate:

1. Students taught by teachers with high verbal ability will learn more than those taught by teachers with low verbal ability.
2. Teacher preparation is important, especially in the areas of science, math, and reading.
3. Students of teachers that are certified within their field of education have higher achievement rates.
4. Students perform better if their teacher has majored or minored in the subject that they are teaching.
5. Experienced teachers are better able to understand their students' learning needs, styles, prerequisites skills, and interests (pp. 5-10)

Glasgow and Hicks (2003) have developed 91 classroom strategies that teachers can use to become more successful by examining the literature. These strategies are grouped into the following twelve categories:

1. Interacting and Collaborating With Students
2. Managing Classroom Organization and Discipline
3. Managing Classroom Time
4. Organizing Curricular Goals, Lesson Plans, and Instructional Delivery
5. Using Student Assessment and Feedback to Maximize Instructional Effectiveness
6. Working With Special Needs Students
7. Celebrating Diversity in the Classroom: Emphasizing the Positive in Cultural, Linguistic, Ethnic, and Gender Identity
8. Integrating Technology in the Classroom
9. Enhancing Teacher Self-Assessment and Reflection
10. Developing a Professional Identity
11. Enhancing Professional Relationships With Colleagues
12. Fostering a Positive Relationship With Parents

(p. Table of Contents)

Countless researchers have developed models and definitions of an effective teacher. Some researchers

emphasize personal traits of the individual. Other researchers focus on the educational background, experience, or intellect of the teacher. Interacting with others, whether students or other teachers is another evaluative measure. Some researchers are more specific in their definitions and some are more generalized. Ayers's (1993) described effective teachers as possessing the traits of "instructing, advising, counseling, organizing, assessing, guiding, goading, showing, managing, modeling, coaching, disciplining, prodding, preaching, persuading, proselytizing, listening, interacting, nursing, and inspiring" (pp. 4-5). This may be true, but it does little to clarify the definition of an effective teacher.

Although there is no clear consensus, there can be little argument this research is invaluable in developing activities for improving the effectiveness of an established staff. All of these areas are well researched and form a comprehensive basis for what an effective teacher looks like. Preference by principals on which of the characteristics they feel are most important will be the basis of this study. This research should also be utilized when hiring new teachers so that the profile of a school leans toward effectiveness instead of mediocrity.

Research on Hiring Practices

Interviewing and hiring are not practices that are only inherent in education. Bell (1989) indicates that in 1987, American businesses spent approximately $26 billion dollars on preparing for, conducting, and evaluating interviews. For this reason, the business and psychology realms have conducted much of the research available on effective hiring practices. In fact, Bell (1989) states that "hour for hour, nothing an employee does is more valuable or more expensive for the company than interviewing" (p. 1).

Eder, Kacmar, and Ferris (1989) describe the history of employment interview research as occurring over 5 periods of time. The earliest time period was between 1915 and 1939 where the primary focus of the research was to develop laundry lists of do's and don'ts in interviewing. During the War Years from 1940 through 1949, much of the large scale research was conducted using enlistees from World War II. The next stage of research occurred between 1950 and 1969 and was referred to as the Search of Process Dynamics. During this period of time "workforce selection and rapid promotion was predicated more on initiative, nepotism, and being in the right place at the right time than on the credentials or abilities one presented at the

employment force (p. 23)." Much of the research during this time centered on interpersonal communication skills and the process dynamics of the employment interview (p. 23).

By the 1970's it was clear that interview behavior was susceptible to a number of influences (Eder, et.al, 1989, p. 25). The period of time between 1970 and 1982 was known as the Interviewer as Limited Information Processor. During this period of time, much of the research on verbal and visual clues was challenged and researchers began to dissent over the value of conducting interviews.

1983 through 1989 focused on Structuring the Interview. Research in the 1980s indicated that structural interview techniques like situational interviewing behavior and description interviewing were much more validated than unstructured interviews (Eder, et. al, 1989).

The value of interviewing has long been contested. Beatty (1994) states that

> Each year, thousands of U.S. companies waste millions of training dollars on interview training. These companies mistakenly believe that by investing in interview skills training alone, they will improve hiring results. The raw truth, unfortunately, is that interview skills training, by itself, will do little

> to improve an organization's ability to hire productive workers. Such training programs frequently focus only on interview techniques - ways of phrasing interview questions to elicit more information from employment candidates. All too frequently, such training ignores the very core of an effective selection process - candidate selection criteria (the critical skills and capabilities essential to successful job performance). (p. 33)

Bell (1989) indicates that managers must become trained in not only interview design, but also in interview techniques. Being versed in both areas enables the manager to make appropriate hiring decision by incorporating the candidate selection criteria into the equation. Half (1993) agrees when he states that "an effective interview involves preparation, careful execution, and follow-up. As axiomatic as that may sound, many employment interviewers fail to pay attention to all three elements" (p. 81).

Why is it that most interviewers do not pay attention to all areas of the interview? Most interviewers, according to Klinvex, O'Connell, and Klinvex (1999), believe they possess special powers that enable them to read people. The final decision about whether or not to hire a prospective candidate often relies on the outcome of

the final interview. They explain that there are at least seven reasons why traditional interviews do not work:

1. Lack of clear interview purpose.
2. Lack of clearly defined position competencies.
3. Lack of interview structure.
4. Lack of preparation.
5. Poor follow-up questioning techniques.
6. Legal liability.
7. Allowing bias to influence the interview.

(Klinvex, O'Connell, and Klinvex 1999, pp. 88-90)

Numbers 1 through 4 involve preparation before the first interview ever occurs. If managers do not spend more time correctly preparing for an interview, they will continue to get poor results.

Klinvex, O'Connell, and Klinvex (1999) introduced reasons why traditional interviews do not work. Herman (1994) states that the "interview is a terrible predictor of job success. Interviews generally take from 30 to 90 minutes, not nearly enough time to get to know someone, yet virtually every hiring decision depends on the employment interview (p. 114)." However, Mercer (1993) reports that many interviewers do feel they have enough time in their work day to spend an hour or more interviewing each candidate.

Herman's negativity toward the employment interview is based on there being many phenomena that impinge upon its value. He lists 17 issues that negatively affect the value of interviews:

The Context Effect. The conditions, such as the location or the order of the candidates, surrounding the interview play a role in how the interview goes.

Too Much Mouth, Not Enough Ears. Interviewers tend to talk too much and listen too little

Signaling. By nodding and smiling at the "right" answers, looking perplexed or disapproving at the "wrong" ones, interviewers inadvertently tip the candidate on the correct answers.

Overconfident Interviewers.

Apples to Oranges. By not asking the same questions of each candidate, it is impossible to compare the candidates later.

Master-Servant Dynamics. When the ego of the interviewer gets in the way.

The Halo Effect. Judging a person's overall abilities based on only one area of competence.

The Negativity Effect. Judging an applicant poorly based on one quality the interviewer finds to be negative.

First Impressions. Decisions are often made during the first few minutes of an interview.

Order-of-Presentation Effect. What the candidate says early in the interview affects the opinion of the interviewer.

Order-of-Interviews Effect. The first people interviewed become the instrument for gauging the others.

Just Like Alfred Error. Attributing traits to a candidate because he or she reminds the interviewer of someone else.

Just Like Me Error. Choosing a candidate because he or she reminds the interviewer of his or herself.

Stereotypes. Research has shown that the sex, race, and age of applicants are related to interviewer evaluations of their behavior, both verbal and nonverbal.

Contrast Effects. Comparing candidates instead of selecting candidates that are best for the job.

Self-Server Errors. Candidates blame failures on outside influences and take credit for their successes.

The Leap of Faith Error. Research shows that many candidates are able to mask their true personality and

only show the interviewer traits that would be favorable for hiring. (Herman, 1994)

Teacher Recruitment

Place and Kowalski (as cited by Westbrook, 1998) note that there has been little research that examines the principal's behavior during teacher selection. However, there has been much research (Cuban, 1984; Lambert, 2003; Stronge, 2002) to note that teacher selection is one of the primary personnel tasks of effective schools. Westbrook (1998) states that "teachers selected by the leader can positively or negatively affect the culture and academic mission of the school" (p. 1).

If the goal of the principal is to hire the most effective teachers for his or her school, careful thought must be used in recruiting and then selecting the correct teacher. Clement (as cited by Protheroe, et.al, 2002) notes that the first step before hiring is to review the hiring process so that it assists in identifying and hiring well-qualified teachers. The National Education Association (2003) found

> "When school districts are faced with a shortage of qualified teachers, they often respond with a haphazard array of strategies to make up for the

shortfall… Districts can be much more effective by first developing a comprehensive plan" (p. 4)

The NEA listed seven steps for developing a comprehensive recruitment plan which included assessing the needs of the school and the clarifying the mission (National Education Association, 2003).

As is apparent in the research, before actually selecting teachers, a careful analysis of the school's needs and a deliberate plan must be in place. This plan will help to identify effective teachers for hiring in the school building.

Teacher Selection

Researchers have identified many techniques and models to be used for selecting quality teachers. Smith and Knab (as cited by Protheroe, et. al , 2002) developed nine attributes of the best hiring systems, two of which were identifying attitudes, behaviors, and skills that characterize the kind of teachers most desirable for the classroom and continually screening for these characteristics at every stage of the process. Longo (2003) asserts that involving teachers in the hiring process removes the mystery of how and why teachers are chosen. Longo also feels that a demonstration lesson is the most important part of the hiring process. Similar to

Longo, Cardinal (2003) notes that "before you begin interviewing candidates, look carefully at your practice characteristics and the personalities and skills of your staff members to help determine what attributes you want your new hire to possess." (p. 46).

Johnson (as cited by Newton & Newton, 2001) developed five clusters that are important in teacher selection. In Johnson's study, the five clusters (communication, credentials, experience, presentation, and activities) were rated by secondary principals for importance. Enthusiasm, interpersonal communication, and oral communication were rated as the most important for teacher selection by secondary principals.

Kisner (1998) examined interviewing techniques for vocational teachers. She notes that the time has come to expand examining credentials and occupational competences of teacher candidates and to start assessing "the candidate's ability to solve problems in the classroom, incorporate academic skills into the classroom, and continue learning new teaching strategies." (Kisner, 1998, p. 1). Kisner then lists five criteria for selecting candidates who better match a school's employment needs. These five criteria are conducting a legal interview, selecting the interview panel, preparing for the interview,

conducting an effective interview, and assessing each candidate consistently. (Kisner, 1998).

Socioeconomic Status

Westbrook (1998) notes that there has been little research on selection issues based on varying socioeconomic status in school districts. Throughout the country people enjoy different socioeconomic status. Neighbor to neighbor, school to school, and district to district vary in their economic status. In 1975, the New Jersey Department of Education introduced the District Factor Grouping system (DFG)(New Jersey Department of Education, 2003a). The DFG provides a method for ranking school districts in New Jersey by their socioeconomic status (SES).

The use of socioeconomic status and educational performance

> "was motivated by research conducted in the late 1960's and early 1970's that showed a strong relationship between socioeconomic status and educational outcomes. The creators of the DFG were concerned that educational policymakers, after reviewing the educational outcomes obtained in different circumstances, would make unjustified inferences about the importance of various, school-based inputs to the educational process. Because the

> research showed that students (i.e. what students bring to school, including socialization that takes place before they step inside the school building) are the most important determinant of educational outcomes, the effectiveness of school systems cannot be sensibly judged without reference to the socioeconomic background of their students." (New Jersey Department of Education web page, 2003a)

The DFG was developed as an equitable method for reporting test scores. Comparisons are made between districts based on their DFG rather than the geographical differences (New Jersey Department of Education, 2003a). 575 of New Jersey's public school districts have been assigned DFG's ranging from A (lowest SES)to J (highest SES)(New Jersey Department of Education, 2003b).

Summary

This chapter was divided into six sections. After the introduction the first section dealt with the importance of teacher selection. The literature supports this importance because there will soon be a dramatic need for new teachers in American schools. Government leaders, principals, and parents cite having effective teachers in their classrooms of utmost importance. It will become important for school leaders to develop a definition of an effective teacher,

based on the available research, and then use this information for hiring effective teachers for the classroom.

Section two examined effective teachers. In this section research was examined from a number of authors on defining and identifying what characteristics make an effective teacher. It became clear from the literature that there is no clear definition of what makes an effective teacher but the research does form a comprehensive listing of traits that effective teachers would possess. This research will be very valuable when principals are selecting new teachers to work in their buildings.

Section three examined teacher recruitment. Research supports that teacher selection is one of the most important personnel tasks a school leader must perform. To assist in hiring effective teachers, leaders must develop careful recruitment plans. Leaders will need to analyze their needs and then hire effective teachers that will fit these needs and are aligned with the school mission.

Section four examined the research on hiring practices, particularly those practices that occur outside of the education realm. An examination of the history of hiring research revealed that there has been continual

change in hiring focus during the twentieth century. Currently there are many problems with hiring practices, especially in the interviewing phase. The high costs of interviewing, the lack of training received by interviewers, and the lack of purpose that exists in many interviews continue to work against the effectiveness of hiring interviews. There are also a number of issues that disrupt he value of hiring interviews due to employer biases.

In section five, types of teacher selection were examined in the literature. There are a number of models and methods available, which include characteristics to look for in a candidate, involving teachers in the hiring process, demonstration lessons, filling voids of the current staff with regards to skill by hiring teachers who possess those skills, interviewing, and problem solving among others.

The final section examined the socioeconomic status of various school districts. Research indicates that little research has been conducted in regards to teacher selection based on socioeconomic status. This section culminated with a description of the socioeconomic status methodology in New Jersey, where this research will be conducted.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationships that may exist between teacher qualities desired by elementary school principals in New Jersey and the socioeconomic status of the district that employs the principal. The qualities that will be examined are grouped into five categories which consist of personal traits, educational background, intellect, professional relationships with others, and knowledge of instructional methods.

The socioeconomic status of a community is very difficult to change (Goddard, Sweetland, & Hoy, 2000), however the qualities of new teachers, desired by principals, might not be. This research will provide information about how principals in other socioeconomic districts select new teachers for their buildings. Knowledge of this criteria and procedures for selecting teachers, if different, might help principals broaden their methods for selecting teachers in their building.

Chapter III will outline the research instrument, methods and procedures that will be used in conducting this study.

Hypotheses

1. There is no significant difference between the teacher candidate qualities desired by the principals based on the socioeconomic status of the district where the principal is employed.
2. There is no significant difference in which hiring practices are used for selecting new teacher candidates based on the socioeconomic status of the district where the principal is employed.
3. There is no significant difference as to how elementary school principals in New Jersey perceive the effectiveness of the hiring practices they utilize based on the socioeconomic status of the district where they work.

Instrument

This study will be conducted using a survey questionnaire, which will be developed by the author. Procedures for creating the questionnaire will utilize information from Arlene Fink (1995) *How to ask survey questions* and Rea and Parker (1997) *Designing and conducting survey research*.

The survey will consist of four sections. The first 3 sections will contain questions that the respondents can answer through Likert scale responses. These answers will be analyzed using quantitative statistical models. The fourth section will allow respondents to offer teacher qualities that they look for and hiring practices that they use in selecting teachers.

Section one of the survey lists 33 qualities or attributes of teacher candidates. Principals will be asked to check the degree of importance that various traits have on influencing them to select a candidate for hire. The qualities listed in the survey are grouped by the category that they have been assigned to facilitate this research. Items 1 through 13 deal with the personal traits of the teacher candidates. Items 14 through 19 describe the educational background of the teacher candidates. Items 20 through 23 describe the perceived intelligence of the teacher candidates. Items 24 through 26 describe the professional relationships of the teacher candidate. Finally, items 27 through 33 describe the teacher candidates' knowledge of instructional methods.

The second section consists of items 34 through 40. In this section, principals are asked to indicate the importance attributed to seven procedures used for selecting teachers.

Section three consists of two statements, items 41 and 42, which allow the principal to indicate their perceptions

of the quality of the methods they employ for hiring and how they perceive their own effectiveness in hiring teachers.

Section four consists of items 43 through 46 and provides a space for the principals to list any criteria or methods that they use in selecting new teachers, but are not included in this survey. Also, principals can write a narrative of how they have changed their hiring methods based on the perceived teacher shortage. Finally, a space is available for the principals to add any additional comments with regard to selecting new teachers. The information in section four will provide for a qualitative analysis.

The survey was examined for validity and reliability. A panel of experts reviewed the questions, the design, and the validity of the instrument. This panel consisted of a superintendent, an assistant superintendent responsible for district hiring, a director of special services, two principals and a vice principal. These six individuals did not participate in the final survey administration. After each member of the panel examined the survey, their responses were noted and the instrument revised. After the instrument was revised, the same panel received the updated instrument and examined for further revisions.

The reliability of this instrument was also assessed. Abrami (2001) states that "reliabilities are correlation coefficients where the range of scores [alpha] is from 0

(no reliability) to +1 (perfect reliability). Reliabilities around .9 are considered excellent; reliabilities below .6 are considered marginal." All of the alphas for this research are listed in Table 1 and none of the alphas were below .6. The alphas range from a low of .6286 (items 14-19) to a high of .8863 (items 1-13).

Table 1
Reliability Alphas for Items 1-42

	Alpha	Standardized Item Alpha
Q1-Q13	.8863	.8963
Q14-Q19	.6286	.6327
Q20-Q23	.6416	.6481
Q24-Q26	.8791	.8888
Q27-Q33	.8501	.8603
Q34-Q40	.6363	.6641
Q41-Q42	.8113	.8127

Data Collection

The instrument was examined and approved by the Seton Hall University Internal Review Board. Once the survey was approved, a cover letter, along with the survey was mailed to 120 elementary principals working in New Jersey schools. 60 surveys were mailed to school leaders in schools with a

DFG of A, B, or CD and 60 surveys were mailed to schools with a DFG of GH, I, or J. The number of surveys were mailed to each category depending upon its percentile representation in its representative socioeconomic group. Table 2 illustrates how many districts are in each of the subcategories based on SES.

Table 2
Determining Factors for Number of Surveys Sent to Each DFG

SES Status	DFG	Total # Districts	Percentile of SES Status	Total sent to district	Total Surveys Sent
Low SES (188 total)	A	35	18.62	11	60
	B	78	41.49	25	
	CD	75	39.89	24	
High SES (194 total)	GH	75	38.66	23	60
	I	104	53.61	32	
	J	15	7.73	5	

Table 2 illustrates that there are 188 total New Jersey school districts that fall into the category of low SES. The low SES category is made up of three subcategories. DFG-A contains 35 districts or 18.62% of the low SES districts, DFG-B contains 78 districts or

41.49%, and DFG-CD contains 75 districts or 39.89%. Using these percents against the total of 60 surveys being sent to low SES districts, it was determined that 11 surveys needed to be sent to DFG-A districts, 25 surveys were sent to DFG-B districts, and 24 surveys were sent to DFG-CD districts. These same calculations were used for the high SES school districts.

To allow for random assignment of which school principals will receive the survey, the school districts were listed alphabetically by DFG. Any district that does not contain an elementary school was eliminated. Since each subgroup DFG contains at least three times as many districts as required, the first alphabetical district was selected in each category and then every third school district was selected. Once all of the districts were selected, schools were selected. If the district had only one elementary school, it was selected. If there was more than one elementary school, the school that was listed first alphabetically was selected.

Each principal received a cover letter, which introduced the researcher, explained the purpose of the study, assured that all answers will remain confidential, and requested a 10-day deadline for responding to the survey. With the letter and survey were mailed a postage-

paid envelope for returning the survey. To increase the participation rate, each school leader was assigned a confidential code number, which was printed on each survey. As the surveys were returned, a non-participating and disinterested person matched the confidential code to the list of principals and school leaders to determine who was participating and who is not. A second survey was then mailed to all non-participants approximately three weeks after the initial mailing.

Data Analysis

Responses from the first 3 sections of the collected surveys were coded based on a five point Likert scale with a sixth choice if that criteria is not used. All of the data collected was collated using SPSS Statistical Software 11.0. This data was analyzed using descriptive statistics. Descriptive statistics provided a number of tables, charts, graphs, and means to make comparisons. Likert scale responses were analyzed using frequency tables and percentages. For each question, mean scores were calculated and then independent sample t tests were conducted using the SPSS 11.0 statistical program to determine if significant differences existed between principals in lower SES school districts and principals in high SES school districts.

In section four, qualitative responses were collected and presented in table form for analysis. These responses were examined for patterns and all responses were included in the finished dissertation. The responses to question 43 were coded according to the six categories established for the quantitative questions of the survey. Those five categories consisted of personal traits, perceived intelligence, educational background, professional relationships, knowledge of instructional methods, and hiring practices. Each response listed in a table and counted for one point for each category. If more than one category could be construed for a response, it was listed for each.

Question 44 was coded with a 1 for yes responses and a 2 for no responses. This question directly relates to questions forty-five.

Question 45 allowed the respondents to describe how they have changed their hiring practices based on a perceived teacher shortage. This question was only answered if a respondent answered yes to question forty-four. Each response was assigned one point and was listed on a table consisting of three categories: before the interview, during the interview, and after the interview.

Question 46 allowed the respondents to add written responses concerning interviewing or selecting new teachers. Each response was assigned one point and listed

on a table consisting of two categories: the interview and selecting new teachers.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

This chapter contains all of the findings and data for the study to describe various teacher-selection criteria that are used by elementary school principals in New Jersey. All of the data was analyzed for similarities and differences based on the socioeconomic status of each district.

A total of 64 responses were received from two mailings sent to one hundred twenty elementary school principals in November, 2004. The 120 elementary school principals were selected randomly based on the percentage of school districts represented in each District Factor Group (DFG). 56 principals did not respond to either mailing by the closing date of December 16, 2004. The response rate for this survey was 53.3% with 46.7% of the lower socioeconomic districts responding and 60% of the higher socioeconomic districts responding.

Five of the 11 selected DFG-A districts responded resulting in a 45.5% response rate. 12 of 25 DFG-B

districts responded resulting in a 48% response rate. 11 of the twenty-four DFG-CD districts responded resulting in a 45.8% response rate. 15 of the twenty-three DFG-GH districts responded resulting in a 65.2% response rate. Nineteen of the thirty-two DFG-I districts responded resulting in a 59.4% response rate. Finally, two of the five DFG-J districts responded resulting in a 40% response rate.

DFG districts A, B, and CD represent the lower socioeconomic (SES) school districts in this study. 28 of sixty lower SES school districts responded with a response rate of 46.7%. DFG districts GH, I, and J represent the higher SES school districts in this study. 36 of the sixty higher SES school districts responded resulting in a response rate of 60%. Table 3 represents the percentage of districts that responded to the survey based on their DFG and the SES.

The survey instrument contained 46 items for the elementary school principals to respond. Section one of the instrument contained five subsections, which contained a total of 33 items that addressed the importance various criteria had on hiring decisions. All items were coded based on a six point Likert scale with one equaling not important; two equaled somewhat important; three equaled

important; four equaled very important; five equaled extremely important; and six equaled unable to determine during an interview.

Table 3
Percentage Response Rate by DFG and SES

SES Status	DFG	Total sent to DFG	Responses Received	Percent Response By DFG	Percent Response by SES
Low SES	A	11	5	45.5	46.7
	B	25	12	48.0	
	CD	24	11	45.8	
High SES	GH	23	15	65.2	60.0
	I	32	19	59.4	
	J	5	2	40.0	

Section two of the instrument contained one subsection that examined the importance of various hiring procedures. This sections was also coded with a six point Likert scale with one equaling not important; two equaled somewhat important; three equaled important; four equaled very important; five equaled extremely important; and six equaled this procedure is not used.

Section three contained one subsection that examined the elementary school principals' perceptions of their own

hiring ability. This section was coded with a five point Likert scale with one equaling not effective; two equaled somewhat effective; three equaled effective; four equaled very effective; and five equaled extremely effective.

Section four contained four items that were qualitative in nature. Responses from principals that offered any criteria they use that were not included in the survey were categorized based on the quantitative section of the survey. Changes that principals made in their hiring practices were categorized based on whether the changes occurred before, during, or after the interview. Finally, additional comments were categorized based on whether they concerned the interview or selecting new teachers (See Table 4).

Table 4
Organization of Survey Instrument

Section	Subsection Title	Number of items
One	Personal Traits	13
	Educational Background	6
	Perceived Intelligence	4
	Professional Relationships	3
	Knowledge of Instructional Methods	7
Two	Hiring Procedures	7
Three	Self-Perceptions Regarding Hiring	2
Four	Qualitative Responses	4

Presentation of the Survey Results

The presentation of the survey results is divided based on the sections of the survey. Each of the quantitative sections will be presented by first presenting a table of the group statistics for that section. Following this table each item will be examined individually and with the mean stated for the principals in both the lower and high SES school districts and then the descriptive statistics individually listed for both SES groups. Finally an

independent t-test analysis will examine which items were statistically significant.

Survey Responses to Items 1 Through 13

Sixty-four respondents completed all of the items in section one of the survey, which contained items one through thirteen. One principal from the lower SES school district did not complete item nine and one principal from higher SES school districts did not complete item one. All other items were addressed by the 64 principals (See Table 5).

Table 5
Group Statistics for Items 1-13

	SES	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Q1	Low SES	28	4.54	.637	.120
	High SES	35	4.74	.817	.138
Q2	Low SES	28	4.79	.418	.079
	High SES	36	4.78	.760	.127
Q3	Low SES	28	3.46	.693	.131
	High SES	36	3.75	1.131	.188
Q4	Low SES	28	3.93	.813	.154
	High SES	36	4.33	1.069	.178
Q5	Low SES	28	4.32	.670	.127
	High SES	36	3.83	1.000	.167
Q6	Low SES	28	4.00	.667	.126
	High SES	36	3.97	.971	.162
Q7	Low SES	28	3.79	.787	.149
	High SES	36	4.06	1.068	.178
Q8	Low SES	28	4.64	.488	.092
	High SES	36	4.58	.906	.151
Q9	Low SES	27	3.96	.854	.164
	High SES	36	4.50	.910	.152
Q10	Low SES	28	3.61	.685	.130
	High SES	36	3.44	1.054	.176
Q11	Low SES	28	4.68	.476	.090
	High SES	36	4.61	.838	.140
Q12	Low SES	28	4.07	.604	.114
	High SES	36	4.28	.914	.152
Q13	Low SES	28	4.75	.441	.083
	High SES	36	4.64	.798	.133

Item one measured how important a candidate's passion for teaching was as a criteria for hiring. Principals responding from the lower SES school districts generated a mean response of 4.54. Since 120 principals were initially surveyed, 60 from the low SES school districts and 60 from the high SES school districts, Percent and Valid Percent are both present in each table for descriptive statistics. The Percent column describes the percentage of principals That selected that trait from the 60 in that SES group. Valid Percent is a more accurate measure because it measures the percentage of principals that selected that trait of the principals that responded to that item. For item one, and all other items, only valid percents will be reported. None of the principals from lower SES school districts rated passion for teaching as not important or somewhat important. Seven point one percent rated passion for teaching as important, 32.1% rated it as very important, and 60.7% rated it as extremely important (See Table 6).

Table 6

Item 1. When making hiring decisions, how important is a passion for teaching to principals in lower SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Important	2	3.3	7.1	7.1
	Very Important	9	15.0	32.1	39.3
	Extremely Important	17	28.3	60.7	100.0
	Total	28	46.7	100.0	
Missing	System	32	53.3		
Total		60	100.0		

The mean response was 4.74 for principals responding from the higher SES school districts. One of the principals in the high SES group did not respond to this question. Two point eight percent of these principals rated passion for teaching as not important, none of the principals rated it as somewhat important, 2.8% rated it as important, 11.1% rated it as very important, and 77.8% rated passion for teaching as extremely important. One principal (2.9%) was unable to determine a candidate's passion for teaching based on an interview. (See Table 7).

Table 7

Item 1. When making hiring decisions, how important is a passion for teaching to principals in higher SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	1	1.7	2.9	2.9
	Important	1	1.7	2.9	5.7
	Very Important	4	6.7	11.4	17.1
	Extremely Important	28	46.7	80.0	97.1
	Unable to determine	1	1.7	2.9	100.0
	Total	35	58.3	100.0	
Missing	System	25	41.7		
Total		60	100.0		

Item two examined the importance of the candidate possessing a positive attitude. It has a mean of 4.79 for lower SES school districts and a mean of 4.78 for higher SES school districts. None of the principals from lower SES school districts rated positive attitude as not important, somewhat important, or important. Twenty-one point four percent rated positive attitude as very important and 78.6% rated it as extremely important (See Table 8).

Table 8

Item 2. When making hiring decisions, how important is a positive attitude to principals in lower SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Important	6	10.0	21.4	21.4
	Extremely Important	22	36.7	78.6	100.0
	Total	28	46.7	100.0	
Missing	System	32	53.3		
Total		60	100.0		

None of the principals from high SES school districts rated positive attitude as somewhat important. Two point eight percent of these principals rated positive attitude as not important, 2.8% rated it as important, 5.6% rated it as very important, and 88.9% rated passion for teaching as extremely important (See Table 9).

Table 9

Item 2. When making hiring decisions, how important is a positive attitude to principals in higher SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	1	1.7	2.8	2.8
	Important	1	1.7	2.8	5.6
	Very Important	2	3.3	5.6	11.1
	Extremely Important	32	53.3	88.9	100.0
	Total	36	60.0	100.0	
Missing	System	24	40.0		
Total		60	100.0		

Item three examined the importance of leadership skills. It has a mean of 3.46 for lower SES school districts and a mean of 3.75 for higher SES school districts. None of the principals from lower SES school districts rated leadership skills as not important. Seven point one percent rated leadership skills as somewhat important, 42.9% rated it as important, 46.4% rated it as somewhat important, and 3.6% rated it as extremely important (See Table 10).

Table 10

Item 3. When making hiring decisions, how important are leadership skills to principals in lower SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Important	2	3.3	7.1	7.1
	Important	12	20.0	42.9	50.0
	Very Important	13	21.7	46.4	96.4
	Extremely Important	1	1.7	3.6	100.0
	Total	28	46.7	100.0	
Missing	System	32	53.3		
Total		60	100.0		

Two point eight percent of the principals from the higher SES school districts rated leadership skills as not important. Five point six percent rated leadership skills as somewhat important, 38.9% rated it as important, 25.0% rated it as somewhat important, and 22.2% rated it as extremely important. There were also two principals, 5.6% who felt they were unable to determine a candidate's leadership skills during an interview (See Table 11).

Table 11

Item 3. When making hiring decisions, how important are leadership skills to principals in high SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	1	1.7	2.8	2.8
	Somewhat Important	2	3.3	5.6	8.3
	Important	14	23.3	38.9	47.2
	Very Important	9	15.0	25.0	72.2
	Extremely Important	8	13.3	22.2	94.4
	Unable to determine	2	3.3	5.6	100.0
	Total	36	60.0	100.0	
Missing	System	24	40.0		
Total		60	100.0		

Item four examined the importance of the candidate's awareness of the classroom surroundings. It has a mean of 3.93 for lower SES school districts and a mean of 4.33 for higher SES school districts. None of the elementary school principals in the lower SES schools rated awareness of classroom surroundings as not important or somewhat important. Thirty-two point one percent of these principals felt classroom awareness was important, 46.4% rated it as very important and 17.9% rated it as extremely important. One elementary school principal from a lower

SES school indicated that a candidate's classroom awareness could not be determined during an interview (See Table 12).

Table 12

Item 4. When making hiring decisions, how important is the candidate's awareness of the classroom surroundings to principals in lower SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Important	9	15.0	32.1	32.1
	Very Important	13	21.7	46.4	78.6
	Extremely Important	5	8.3	17.9	96.4
	Unable to determine	1	1.7	3.6	100.0
	Total	28	46.7	100.0	
Missing	System	32	53.3		
Total		60	100.0		

In the higher SES elementary schools, none of the principals felt that classroom awareness was somewhat important. Two point eight percent of the principals felt classroom awareness was not important, 16.7% rated it as important, 33.3% rated it as very important, and 36.1% rated classroom awareness as extremely important. Four principals, or 11.1% felt that they were unable to determine a candidate's awareness of the classroom during an interview (See Table 13).

Table 13

Item 4. When making hiring decisions, how important is the candidate's awareness of the classroom surroundings to principals in higher SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	1	1.7	2.8	2.8
	Important	6	10.0	16.7	19.4
	Very Important	12	20.0	33.3	52.8
	Extremely Important	13	21.7	36.1	88.9
	Unable to determine	4	6.7	11.1	100.0
	Total	36	60.0	100.0	
Missing	System	24	40.0		
Total		60	100.0		

Item five examined the importance of creativity. Creativity has a mean score of 4.32 for lower SES school principals and a mean of 3.83 for higher SES school principals. None of the principals from New Jersey's lower SES schools rated creativity as not important or somewhat important. Ten point seven percent rated creativity as important, 46.4% rated it as very important, and 42.9% rated creativity as extremely important (See Table 14).

Table 14

Item 5. When making hiring decisions, how important is creativity to principals in lower SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Important	3	5.0	10.7	10.7
	Very Important	13	21.7	46.4	57.1
	Extremely Important	12	20.0	42.9	100.0
	Total	28	46.7	100.0	
Missing	System	32	53.3		
Total		60	100.0		

In the higher SES school districts, 2.8% felt creativity was not important, 5.6% rated it as somewhat important, 22.2% rated it as important, 47.2% rated it as very important, and 19.4% rated creativity as extremely important. One principal, from a higher SES school district was unable to determine a candidate's creativity from an interview (See Table 15).

Table 15

Item 5. When making hiring decisions, how important is creativity to principals in higher SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	1	1.7	2.8	2.8
	Somewhat Important	2	3.3	5.6	8.3
	Important	8	13.3	22.2	30.6
	Very Important	17	28.3	47.2	77.8
	Extremely Important	7	11.7	19.4	97.2
	Unable to determine	1	1.7	2.8	100.0
	Total	36	60.0	100.0	
Missing	System	24	40.0		
Total		60	100.0		

Item six examined the importance of humor. Humor has a mean of 4.00 for principals working in lower SES school districts and a mean of 3.97 for principals working in higher SES school districts. None of the principals in the lower SES school districts felt humor was not important. Three point six percent felt humor was somewhat important, 10.7% rated it as important, 67.9% rated it as very important, and 17.9% rated it as extremely important (See Table 16).

Table 16

Item 6. When making hiring decisions, how important is humor to principals in lower SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Important	1	1.7	3.6	3.6
	Important	3	5.0	10.7	14.3
	Very Important	19	31.7	67.9	82.1
	Extremely Important	5	8.3	17.9	100.0
	Total	28	46.7	100.0	
Missing	System	32	53.3		
Total		60	100.0		

In the higher SES school districts, 2.8% of the principals rated humor as not important, 2.8% rated it as somewhat important, 22.2% rated it as important, 38.9% rated it as very important, and 33.3% rated it as extremely important (See Table 17).

Table 17

Item 6. When making hiring decisions, how important is humor to principals in higher SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	1	1.7	2.8	2.8
	Somewhat Important	1	1.7	2.8	5.6
	Important	8	13.3	22.2	27.8
	Very Important	14	23.3	38.9	66.7
	Extremely Important	12	20.0	33.3	100.0
	Total	36	60.0	100.0	
Missing	System	24	40.0		
Total		60	100.0		

Item seven examined the importance of charisma. It has a mean of 3.79 for principals from lower SES school districts in New Jersey and a mean of 4.06 for principals in higher SES school districts. None of the principals from the lower SES school districts rated charisma as not important. Seven point one percent rated charisma as somewhat important, 21.4% rated it as important, 57.1% rated it as very important, and 14.3% rated charisma as extremely important (See Table 18).

Table 18

Item 7. When making hiring decisions, how important is charisma to principals in lower SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Important	2	3.3	7.1	7.1
	Important	6	10.0	21.4	28.6
	Very Important	16	26.7	57.1	85.7
	Extremely Important	4	6.7	14.3	100.0
	Total	28	46.7	100.0	
Missing	System	32	53.3		
Total		60	100.0		

In the higher SES school districts, none of the principals rated charisma as somewhat important. Five point six percent rated charisma as not important, 16.7% rated it as important, 41.7% rated it as very important, and 33.3% rated it as extremely important. One principal, or 2.8% of the principals in higher SES school districts, were unable to determine charisma during an interview (See Table 19).

Table 19

Item 7. When making hiring decisions, how important is charisma to principals in higher SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	2	3.3	5.6	5.6
	Important	6	10.0	16.7	22.2
	Very Important	15	25.0	41.7	63.9
	Extremely Important	12	20.0	33.3	97.2
	Unable to determine	1	1.7	2.8	100.0
	Total	36	60.0	100.0	
Missing	System	24	40.0		
Total		60	100.0		

Item eight examined the importance of the candidate's ability to motivate. It has a mean of 4.64 for the principals responding from lower SES school districts in New Jersey and a mean of 4.58 for principals in higher SES school districts. In the lower SES school districts, no principal rated the ability to motivate as not important, somewhat important, or important. Thirty-five point seven percent rated the ability to motivate as very important and 64.3% rated it as extremely important (See Table 20).

Table 20

Item 8. When making hiring decisions, how important is the ability to motivate to principals in lower SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Important	10	16.7	35.7	35.7
	Extremely Important	18	30.0	64.3	100.0
	Total	28	46.7	100.0	
Missing	System	32	53.3		
Total		60	100.0		

None of the principals that responded from higher SES school districts in New Jersey rated the ability to motivate as somewhat important. Two point eight percent rated the ability to motivate as not important, 5.6% rated it as important, 25% rated it as very important, and 61.1% rated it as extremely important. Two of these principals, or 5.6%, were unable to determine a candidate's ability to motivate through an interview (See Table 21).

Table 21

Item 8. When making hiring decisions, how important is the ability to motivate to principals in higher SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	1	1.7	2.8	2.8
	Important	2	3.3	5.6	8.3
	Very Important	9	15.0	25.0	33.3
	Extremely Important	22	36.7	61.1	94.4
	Unable to determine	2	3.3	5.6	100.0
	Total	36	60.0	100.0	
Missing	System	24	40.0		
Total		60	100.0		

Item nine examined the importance of values. It has a mean of 3.96 for principals responding from lower SES school districts and a mean of 4.50 for principals responding from the higher SES school districts. In the lower SES school districts, none of the principals felt values were not important. Three point seven percent rated values as somewhat important, 25% rated it as important, 39.3% rated it as very important, and 28.6% rated it as extremely important. One principal, or 3.6%, was unable to rate values based on an interview and one principal did not respond to this item (See Table 22).

Table 22

Item 9. When making hiring decisions, how important are values to principals in lower SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Important	1	1.7	3.7	3.7
	Important	7	11.7	25.9	29.6
	Very Important	11	18.3	40.7	70.4
	Extremely Important	8	13.3	29.6	100.0
	Total	27	45.0	100.0	
Missing	System	33	55.0		
Total		60	100.0		

None of the principals that responded from the higher SES school districts rated values as somewhat important. Two point eight percent rated values as not important, 2.8% rated it as important, 41.7% rated it as very important, and 44.4% rated it as extremely important. Three principals, or 8.3%, were unable to determine a candidate's values based on an interview (See Table 23).

Table 23

Item 9. When making hiring decisions, how important are values to principals in higher SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	1	1.7	2.8	2.8
	Important	1	1.7	2.8	5.6
	Very Important	15	25.0	41.7	47.2
	Extremely Important	16	26.7	44.4	91.7
	Unable to determine	3	5.0	8.3	100.0
	Total	36	60.0	100.0	
Missing	System	24	40.0		
Total		60	100.0		

Item ten examined the importance of appearance. It has a mean of 3.61 among the principals from the lower SES school districts and a mean of 3.44 for principals from the higher SES school districts. None of the principals from the lower SES schools felt that appearance was not important. Seven point one percent felt appearance was somewhat important, 28.6% rated it as important, 60.7% rated it as very important, and 3.6% rated appearance as extremely important (See Table 24).

Table 24

Item 10. When making hiring decisions, how important is appearance to principals in lower SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Important	2	3.3	7.1	7.1
	Important	8	13.3	28.6	35.7
	Very Important	17	28.3	60.7	96.4
	Extremely Important	1	1.7	3.6	100.0
	Total	28	46.7	100.0	
Missing	System	32	53.3		
Total		60	100.0		

Two point eight percent of the principals responding from the higher SES school districts rated appearance as not important, 13.9% rated it as somewhat important, 38.9% rated it as important, 25% rated it as very important, and 19.4% rated appearance as extremely important (See Table 25).

Table 25

Item 10. When making hiring decisions, how important is appearance to principals in higher SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	1	1.7	2.8	2.8
	Somewhat Important	5	8.3	13.9	16.7
	Important	14	23.3	38.9	55.6
	Very Important	9	15.0	25.0	80.6
	Extremely Important	7	11.7	19.4	100.0
	Total	36	60.0	100.0	
Missing	System	24	40.0		
Total		60	100.0		

Item 11 examined the importance of enthusiasm. It has a mean of 4.68 for lower SES school districts and a mean of 4.61 for higher SES school districts. None of the principals in the lower SES school districts that responded to this survey rated enthusiasm as not important, somewhat important, or important. A rating of very important was given by 32.1% of the principals from the lower SES school districts and 67.9% of the principals rated enthusiasm as extremely important (See Table 26).

Table 26

Item 11. When making hiring decisions, how important is enthusiasm to principals in lower SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Important	9	15.0	32.1	32.1
	Extremely Important	19	31.7	67.9	100.0
	Total	28	46.7	100.0	
Missing	System	32	53.3		
Total		60	100.0		

None of the principals in the higher SES school districts rated enthusiasm as somewhat important. Two point eight percent rated enthusiasm as not important, 2.8% rated it as important, 25% rated it as very important, and 66.7% rated it as extremely important. One principal, or 2.8%, were unable to determine enthusiasm through an interview (See Table 27).

Table 27

Item 11. When making hiring decisions, how important is enthusiasm to principals in higher SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	1	1.7	2.8	2.8
	Important	1	1.7	2.8	5.6
	Very Important	9	15.0	25.0	30.6
	Extremely Important	24	40.0	66.7	97.2
	Unable to determine	1	1.7	2.8	100.0
	Total	36	60.0	100.0	
Missing	System	24	40.0		
Total		60	100.0		

Item 12 examined the importance of organization. It has a mean of 4.07 for lower SES school districts and a mean of 4.28 for higher SES school districts. None of the principals from the lower SES schools rated organization as not important or somewhat important. Fourteen point three percent rated organization as important, 64.3% rated it as very important, and 21.4% rated organization as extremely important (See Table 28).

Table 28

Item 12. When making hiring decisions, how important is organization to principals in lower SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Important	4	6.7	14.3	14.3
	Very Important	18	30.0	64.3	78.6
	Extremely Important	6	10.0	21.4	100.0
	Total	28	46.7	100.0	
Missing	System	32	53.3		
Total		60	100.0		

In the higher SES school districts, none of the principals rated organization as somewhat important. Two point eight percent rated organization as not important, 11.1% rated it as important, 41.7% rated it as very important, and 41.7% rated organization as extremely important. One principal from this group, or 2.8% was unable to determine a candidate's organizational abilities through an interview (See Table 29).

Table 29

Item 12. When making hiring decisions, how important is organization to principals in higher SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	1	1.7	2.8	2.8
	Important	4	6.7	11.1	13.9
	Very Important	15	25.0	41.7	55.6
	Extremely Important	15	25.0	41.7	97.2
	Unable to determine	1	1.7	2.8	100.0
	Total	36	60.0	100.0	
Missing	System	24	40.0		
Total		60	100.0		

Item 13 examined the importance of a candidate's ability to communicate. It has a mean of 4.75 for lower SES school districts and a mean of 4.64 for higher SES school districts. None of the principals from the lower SES schools rated communication as not important, somewhat important, or important. Twenty-five percent of the principals from lower SES school districts rated communication as very important and 75% rated communication as extremely important (See Table 30).

Table 30

Item 13. When making hiring decisions, how important is the ability to communicate to principals in lower SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Important	7	11.7	25.0	25.0
	Extremely Important	21	35.0	75.0	100.0
	Total	28	46.7	100.0	
Missing	System	32	53.3		
Total		60	100.0		

None of the principals in the higher SES school districts rated communication as somewhat important. Two point eight percent of the principals rated communication as not important, 2.8% rated it as important, 19.4% rated it as very important, and 75% rated communication as extremely important (See Table 31).

Table 31

Item 13. When making hiring decisions, how important is the ability to communicate to principals in higher SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	1	1.7	2.8	2.8
	Important	1	1.7	2.8	5.6
	Very Important	7	11.7	19.4	25.0
	Extremely Important	27	45.0	75.0	100.0
	Total	36	60.0	100.0	
Missing	System	24	40.0		
Total		60	100.0		

A comparison of the means between the principals from the lower SES and higher SES school districts was conducted by using independent samples T-Tests. The results of the independent samples T-Test for items 1 through 13 are listed in Tables 32 and 33.

Table 32

Independent Samples T-Test for Items 1 through 7

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means				
		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
Q1	Equal variances assumed	.371	.545	-1.100	61	.276	-.21	.188
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.131	60.972	.263	-.21	.183
Q2	Equal variances assumed	.206	.652	.050	62	.961	.01	.160
	Equal variances not assumed			.053	56.437	.958	.01	.149
Q3	Equal variances assumed	6.297	.015	-1.175	62	.244	-.29	.243
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.245	59.098	.218	-.29	.229
Q4	Equal variances assumed	2.917	.093	-1.663	62	.101	-.40	.243
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.720	61.980	.090	-.40	.235
Q5	Equal variances assumed	1.193	.279	2.222	62	.030	.49	.220
	Equal variances not assumed			2.332	60.796	.023	.49	.209
Q6	Equal variances assumed	5.098	.027	.129	62	.897	.03	.215
	Equal variances not assumed			.135	61.165	.893	.03	.205
Q7	Equal variances assumed	.763	.386	-1.121	62	.267	-.27	.241
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.164	61.852	.249	-.27	.232

Table 32 describes the comparison of the means between principals from lower and higher SES school districts for items 1 through 7. The data suggests that only one statistically significant difference exists with a significance level of $p<.050$. Item five has a t value of 2.222 and is significant at the .030 level based on Levene's Test of Equality since the variances in each SES group do not differ significantly from each other (p=.279). Therefore an equality of the variance can be assumed and the t-test remains as reported. This data would suggest that under Section One of the survey (Personal Traits), a statistically significant difference exists between the principals from the lower SES school districts and the principals from the higher SES school districts with respect to Creativity. The positive t value would suggest that principals from the lower SES school districts allot a higher importance to creativity than the principals from the higher SES school districts when hiring new teachers.

Table 33

Independent Samples T-Test for Items 8 through 13

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means				
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
Q8	Equal variances assumed	3.167	.080	.314	62	.755	.06	.190
	Equal variances not assumed			.336	55.886	.738	.06	.177
Q9	Equal variances assumed	.120	.730	-2.379	61	.021	-.54	.226
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.401	57.936	.020	-.54	.224
Q10	Equal variances assumed	6.442	.014	.708	62	.482	.16	.230
	Equal variances not assumed			.745	60.293	.459	.16	.218
Q11	Equal variances assumed	1.977	.165	.381	62	.705	.07	.177
	Equal variances not assumed			.406	57.273	.686	.07	.166
Q12	Equal variances assumed	5.116	.027	-1.031	62	.306	-.21	.200
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.084	60.591	.283	-.21	.190
Q13	Equal variances assumed	2.078	.155	.661	62	.511	.11	.168
	Equal variances not assumed			.708	56.562	.482	.11	.157

Table 33 describes the comparison of the means between principals from lower and higher SES school districts for items 8 through 13. The data suggests that only one

statistically significant difference exists with a significance level of $p<.050$. Item nine has a t value of (-2.379) and is significant at the .021 level based on Levene's Test of Equality since the variances in each SES group do not differ significantly from each other (p=.730). Therefore an equality of the variance can be assumed and the T-Test remains as reported. This data would suggest that under Section One of the survey (Personal Traits), a statistically significant difference exists between the principals from the lower SES school districts and the principals from the higher SES school districts with respect to Values. The negative t value would suggest that principals from the higher SES school districts rate a higher importance to values than the principals from the lower SES school districts when hiring new teachers.

Survey Responses to Items 14 Through 19

Items 14 through 19 measured the importance the principals placed upon the educational background of the candidate they were hiring. Each of the items in this section of the survey was responded to by all 64 of the principals (See Table 34).

Table 34

Group Statistics for Items 14-19

	SES	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Q14	Low SES	28	3.57	1.574	.297
	High SES	36	3.92	1.156	.193
Q15	Low SES	28	2.32	1.056	.200
	High SES	36	2.89	1.141	.190
Q16	Low SES	28	2.61	1.133	.214
	High SES	36	3.17	1.082	.180
Q17	Low SES	28	3.86	1.044	.197
	High SES	36	3.67	1.014	.169
Q18	Low SES	28	3.14	1.008	.190
	High SES	36	3.00	1.121	.187
Q19	Low SES	28	3.43	1.168	.221
	High SES	36	2.92	1.156	.193

Item 14 examined the importance of possessing a standard certificate as opposed to possessing an alternate certificate. It has a mean of 3.57 for principals from the lower SES school districts and a mean of 3.92 for principals from the higher SES districts. Seventeen point nine percent of the principals that responded from the lower SES schools rated the possession of a standard certificate as not important, 10.7% rated it as somewhat important, 10.7% rated it as important, 17.9% rated it as very important, and 42.9% rated it as extremely important (See Table 35).

Table 35

Item 14. When making hiring decisions, how important is the possession of a standard certificate to principals in lower SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	5	8.3	17.9	17.9
	Somewhat Important	3	5.0	10.7	28.6
	Important	3	5.0	10.7	39.3
	Very Important	5	8.3	17.9	57.1
	Extremely Important	12	20.0	42.9	100.0
	Total	28	46.7	100.0	
Missing	System	32	53.3		
Total		60	100.0		

Five point six percent of the principals from the higher SES school districts in New Jersey rated the possession of a standard certificate as not important, 2.8% rated it as somewhat important, 27.8% rated it as important, 22.2% rated it as very important, and 41.7% rated it as extremely important (See Table 36).

Table 36

Item 14. When making hiring decisions, how important is the possession of a standard certificate to principals in higher SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	2	3.3	5.6	5.6
	Somewhat Important	1	1.7	2.8	8.3
	Important	10	16.7	27.8	36.1
	Very Important	8	13.3	22.2	58.3
	Extremely Important	15	25.0	41.7	100.0
	Total	36	60.0	100.0	
Missing	System	24	40.0		
Total		60	100.0		

Item 15 examined the importance of possessing multiple certificates. It has a mean of 2.32 for principals from the lower SES school districts and a mean of 2.89 for principals from the higher SES districts. None of the elementary school principals from the lower SES school districts rated this as extremely important. Twenty-five percent rated the possession of multiple certificates as not important, 35.7% rated it as somewhat important, 21.4% rated it as important, and 17.9% rated it as very important (See Table 37).

Table 37

Item 15. When making hiring decisions, how important is the possession of multiple certificates to principals in lower SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	7	11.7		25.0
	Somewhat Important	10	16.7	35.7	60.7
	Important	6	10.0	21.4	82.1
	Very Important	5	8.3	17.9	100.0
	Total	28	46.7		
Missing	System	32	53.3		
Total		60	100.0		

Thirteen point nine percent of the principals in the higher SES school districts rated the possession of multiple certificates as not important, 22.2% rated it as somewhat important, 30.6% rated it as important, 27.8% rated it as very important, and 5.6% rated it as extremely important (See Table 38).

Table 38

Item 15. When making hiring decisions, how important is the possession of multiple certificates to principals in higher SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	5	8.3	13.9	13.9
	Somewhat Important	8	13.3	22.2	36.1
	Important	11	18.3	30.6	66.7
	Very Important	10	16.7	27.8	94.4
	Extremely Important	2	3.3	5.6	100.0
	Total	36	60.0	100.0	
Missing	System	24	40.0		
Total		60	100.0		

Item 16 examined the importance of teaching experience. It has a mean of 2.61 for principals from the lower SES school districts and a mean of 3.17 for principals from the higher SES districts. Teaching experience was rated as not important by 17.9% of the principals from the lower SES school districts, 32.1% rated it as somewhat important, 25% rated it as important, 21.4% rated it as very important, and 3.6% rated teaching experience as extremely important (See Table 39).

Table 39

Item 16. When making hiring decisions, how important is teaching experience to principals in lower SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	5	8.3	17.9	17.9
	Somewhat Important	9	15.0	32.1	50.0
	Important	7	11.7	25.0	75.0
	Very Important	6	10.0	21.4	96.4
	Extremely Important	1	1.7	3.6	100.0
	Total	28	46.7	100.0	
Missing	System	32	53.3		
Total		60	100.0		

Eight point three percent of the principals from the higher SES school districts rated teaching experience as not important. 13.9% of these same principals rated teaching experience as somewhat important, 41.7% rated it as important, 25% rated it as very important, and 11.1% rated it as extremely important (See Table 40).

Table 40

Item 16. When making hiring decisions, how important is teaching experience to principals in higher SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	3	5.0	8.3	8.3
	Somewhat Important	5	8.3	13.9	22.2
	Important	15	25.0	41.7	63.9
	Very Important	9	15.0	25.0	88.9
	Extremely Important	4	6.7	11.1	100.0
	Total	36	60.0	100.0	
Missing	System	24	40.0		
Total		60	100.0		

Item 17 examined the importance of the ability of a candidate to work with children with special needs. It has a mean of 3.86 for principals from the lower SES school districts and a mean of 3.67 for principals from the higher SES districts. None of the principals in the lower SES school districts rated this item as not important. Three point six percent rated working with children with special needs as somewhat important, 46.4% rated it as important, 14.3% rated it as very important, and 32.1% rated it as extremely important. One principal, or 3.6%, was unable to

determine a candidate's ability to work with children with special needs through an interview (See Table 41).

Table 41

Item 17. When making hiring decisions, how important is the ability to work with special needs children to principals in lower SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Important	1	1.7	3.6	3.6
	Important	13	21.7	46.4	50.0
	Very Important	4	6.7	14.3	64.3
	Extremely Important	9	15.0	32.1	96.4
	Unable to determine	1	1.7	3.6	100.0
	Total	28	46.7	100.0	
Missing	System	32	53.3		
Total		60	100.0		

Two point eight percent of the principals from higher SES school districts rated the ability to work with children with specials needs as not important. Five point six percent of the this same groups of principals rated the ability to work with children with specials needs as somewhat important, 38.9% rated it as important, 27.8% rated it as very important, and 25% rated it as extremely important (see Table 42).

Table 42

Item 17. When making hiring decisions, how important is the ability to work with special needs students to principals in higher SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	1	1.7	2.8	2.8
	Somewhat Important	2	3.3	5.6	8.3
	Important	14	23.3	38.9	47.2
	Very Important	10	16.7	27.8	75.0
	Extremely Important	9	15.0	25.0	100.0
	Total	36	60.0	100.0	
Missing	System	24	40.0		
Total		60	100.0		

Item 18 examined the importance of former observations. It has a mean of 3.14 for principals from the lower SES school districts and a mean of 3.00 for principals from the higher SES districts. None of the principals from the lower SES school districts rated former observations as not important. Twenty-eight point six percent rated former observations as somewhat important, 39.3% rated it as important, 25% rated it as very important, and 3.6% rated it as extremely important. One principal, 3.6%, was unable

to determine the importance of former observations during an interview (See Table 43).

Table 43

Item 18. When making hiring decisions, how important are former observations (when applicable) to principals in lower SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Important	8	13.3	28.6	28.6
	Important	11	18.3	39.3	67.9
	Very Important	7	11.7	25.0	92.9
	Extremely Important	1	1.7	3.6	96.4
	Unable to determine	1	1.7	3.6	100.0
	Total	28	46.7	100.0	
Missing	System	32	53.3		
Total		60	100.0		

Former observations were rated as not important by 5.6% of the principals from the higher SES school districts. Thirty-six point one percent of this same group of principals rated former observations as somewhat important, 19.4% rated it as important, 30.6% rated it as very important, and 8.3% rated former observations as extremely important (See Table 44).

Table 44

Item 18. When making hiring decisions, how important are former observations (when applicable) to principals in higher SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	2	3.3	5.6	5.6
	Somewhat Important	13	21.7	36.1	41.7
	Important	7	11.7	19.4	61.1
	Very Important	11	18.3	30.6	91.7
	Extremely Important	3	5.0	8.3	100.0
	Total	36	60.0	100.0	
Missing	System	24	40.0		
Total		60	100.0		

Item 19 examined the importance of the cooperating teacher's observation from student teaching. It has a mean of 3.43 for principals from the lower SES school districts and a mean of 2.92 for principals from the higher SES districts. Three point six percent of the principals from lower SES school districts rated the cooperating teacher's observations as not important, 17.9% rated it as somewhat important, 32.1% rated it as important, 28.6% rated it as very important, and 14.3% rated it as extremely important. One principal, 3.6%, was unable to determine the importance

of the cooperating teacher's observation based on the interview (See Table 45).

Table 45

Item 19. When making hiring decisions, how important is the cooperating teacher's observation to principals in lower SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	1	1.7	3.6	3.6
	Somewhat Important	5	8.3	17.9	21.4
	Important	9	15.0	32.1	53.6
	Very Important	8	13.3	28.6	82.1
	Extremely Important	4	6.7	14.3	96.4
	Unable to determine	1	1.7	3.6	100.0
	Total	28	46.7	100.0	
Missing	System	32	53.3		
Total		60	100.0		

Eight point three percent of the principals from the higher SES school districts rated the cooperating teacher's observation as not important. Thirty-six point one percent of this same group rated the cooperating teacher's observation as somewhat important, 19.4% rated it as important, 27.8% rated it as very important, and 8.3% rated it as extremely important (See Table 46).

Table 46

Item 19. When making hiring decisions, how important is the cooperating teacher's observation to principals in higher SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	3	5.0	8.3	8.3
	Somewhat Important	13	21.7	36.1	44.4
	Important	7	11.7	19.4	63.9
	Very Important	10	16.7	27.8	91.7
	Extremely Important	3	5.0	8.3	100.0
	Total	36	60.0	100.0	
Missing	System	24	40.0		
Total		60	100.0		

A comparison of the means between the principals from the lower SES and higher SES school districts was conducted by using independent samples T-Tests. The results of the independent samples T-Test for item 14 through 19 are listed in Table 47.

Table 47

Independent Samples T-Test for Items 14 through 19

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means				
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
Q14	Equal variances assumed	6.525	.013	-1.012	62	.315	-.35	.341
	Equal variances not assumed			-.974	47.904	.335	-.35	.354
Q15	Equal variances assumed	.037	.849	-2.039	62	.046	-.57	.278
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.059	60.079	.044	-.57	.276
Q16	Equal variances assumed	.762	.386	-2.010	62	.049	-.56	.278
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.998	56.831	.050	-.56	.280
Q17	Equal variances assumed	.379	.540	.736	62	.465	.19	.259
	Equal variances not assumed			.733	57.348	.466	.19	.260
Q18	Equal variances assumed	1.367	.247	.528	62	.599	.14	.270
	Equal variances not assumed			.535	60.647	.594	.14	.267
Q19	Equal variances assumed	.021	.885	1.749	62	.085	.51	.293
	Equal variances not assumed			1.747	57.876	.086	.51	.293

Table 47 describes the comparison of the means between principals from lower and higher SES school districts for items 14 through 19. The data suggests two statistically

significant differences exist with a significance level of $p<.050$. Item 15 has a *t* value of (-2.039) and is significant at the .046 level based on Levene's Test of Equality since the variances do not differ significantly from each other (p=.849). Item 16 was also statistically significant with a *t* value of (-2.010) and is significant at the .049 level based on Levene's Test of Equality since the variances do not differ significantly from each other (p=.386). Therefore an equality of the variances can be assumed and the t-test remains as reported. This data would suggest that under Section One of the survey (Educational Background), a statistically significant difference exists between principals from the lower SES school districts and the higher SES school districts with respect to the importance of *Possessing Multiple Certificates* and *Teaching Experience*.

Item 15 had a negative *t* value (-2.039) which would suggest that principals from the higher SES school districts placed a greater importance on the possession of multiple certificates (as opposed to one certificate) than the principals from the lower SES school districts. Item 16 also had a negative *t* value (-2.010) which would suggest that principals from the higher SES school districts placed

a greater importance on teaching experience than the principals from the lower SES school districts.

Survey Responses to Items 20 Through 23

Items 20 through 23 measured the importance that principals from lower and higher SES school districts place on perceived intelligence. Each of the four items was responded to by all 64 respondents (See Table 48).

Table 48

Group Statistics for Items 20 through 23

	SES	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Q20	Low SES	28	2.89	.916	.173
	High SES	36	3.50	1.082	.180
Q21	Low SES	28	2.86	1.044	.197
	High SES	36	3.61	1.202	.200
Q22	Low SES	28	3.89	.737	.139
	High SES	36	3.94	1.013	.169
Q23	Low SES	28	3.50	1.139	.215
	High SES	36	3.19	1.091	.182

Item 20 examined the importance of a candidate's overall grade point average. It has a mean of 2.89 for principals from the lower SES school districts and a mean of 3.50 for principals from the higher SES districts. None of the principals from the lower SES school districts rated overall grade point average as extremely important. Three

point six percent of the principals from lower SES school districts rated overall grade point average as not important, 25% as somewhat important, 57.1% as important, and 10.7% as somewhat important. One principal, or 3.6%, was unable to determine the importance of overall grade point average based on an interview (See Table 49).

Table 49

Item 20. When making hiring decisions, how important is the candidate's overall grade point average to principals in lower SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	1	1.7	3.6	3.6
	Somewhat Important	7	11.7	25.0	28.6
	Important	16	26.7	57.1	85.7
	Very Important	3	5.0	10.7	96.4
	Unable to determine	1	1.7	3.6	100.0
	Total	28	46.7	100.0	
Missing	System	32	53.3		
Total		60	100.0		

Five point six percent of the principals from higher SES school districts rated overall grade point average as not important, 8.3% rated it as somewhat important, 33.3% rated it as important, 38.9% rated it as very important, and 11.1% rated overall grade point average as extremely

important. One principal, 2.8%, was unable to determine the importance of grade point average through an interview (See Table 50).

Table 50

Item 20. When making hiring decisions, how important is the candidate's overall grade point average to principals in higher SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	2	3.3	5.6	5.6
	Somewhat Important	3	5.0	8.3	13.9
	Important	12	20.0	33.3	47.2
	Very Important	14	23.3	38.9	86.1
	Extremely Important	4	6.7	11.1	97.2
	Unable to determine	1	1.7	2.8	100.0
	Total	36	60.0	100.0	
Missing	System	24	40.0		
Total		60	100.0		

Item 21 examined the importance of the candidate's educational course work grade point average. It has a mean of 2.86 for principals from the lower SES school districts and a mean of 3.61 for principals from the higher SES districts. None of the principals in the lower SES school districts rated educational course work grade point average

as extremely important. Ten point seven percent of the principals from lower SES school districts rated it as not important, 17.9% rated it as somewhat important, 53.6% rated it as important, and 14.3% rated it as very important. One principal, 3.6%, was unable to determine a candidate's educational course work grade point average during an interview (See Table 51).

Table 51

Item 21. When making hiring decisions, how important is the candidate's education course work grade point average to principals in lower SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	3	5.0	10.7	10.7
	Somewhat Important	5	8.3	17.9	28.6
	Important	15	25.0	53.6	82.1
	Very Important	4	6.7	14.3	96.4
	Unable to determine	1	1.7	3.6	100.0
	Total	28	46.7	100.0	
Missing	System	32	53.3		
Total		60	100.0		

In the higher SES school districts 8.3% of the principals rated the candidate's educational course work grade point average as not important, 5.6% rated it as

somewhat important, 27.8% rated it as important,36.1% rated it as very important, and 19.4% rated it as extremely important. One principal, 2.8%, was unable to determine the candidate's overall educational grade point average based on the interview (See Table 52).

Table 52

Item 21. When making hiring decisions, how important is the candidate's education course work grade point average to principals in higher SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	3	5.0	8.3	8.3
	Somewhat Important	2	3.3	5.6	13.9
	Important	10	16.7	27.8	41.7
	Very Important	13	21.7	36.1	77.8
	Extremely Important	7	11.7	19.4	97.2
	Unable to determine	1	1.7	2.8	100.0
	Total	36	60.0	100.0	
Missing	System	24	40.0		
Total		60	100.0		

Item 22 examined the importance of the candidate's knowledge of the elementary school curriculum. It has a mean of 3.89 for principals from the lower SES school districts and a mean of 3.94 for principals from the higher

SES districts. None of the principals in the lower SES school districts rated a candidate's knowledge of elementary school curriculum as not important, 7.1% rated it as somewhat important, 10.7% rated it as important, 67.9% rated it as very important, and 14.3% rated it as extremely important (See Table 53).

Table 53

Item 22. When making hiring decisions, how important is the candidate's knowledge of elementary school curriculum to principals in lower SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Important	2	3.3	7.1	7.1
	Important	3	5.0	10.7	17.9
	Very Important	19	31.7	67.9	85.7
	Extremely Important	4	6.7	14.3	100.0
	Total	28	46.7	100.0	
Missing	System	32	53.3		
Total		60	100.0		

In the higher SES school districts, 2.8% of the principals rated the candidate's knowledge of the elementary school curriculum as not important. Five point six percent of this same group of principals rated knowledge of the elementary school curriculum as somewhat

important, 19.4% rated it as important, 38.9% rated it as very important, and 33.3% rated it as extremely important (See Table 54).

Table 54

Item 22. When making hiring decisions, how important is the candidate's knowledge of elementary school curriculum to principals in higher SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	1	1.7	2.8	2.8
	Somewhat Important	2	3.3	5.6	8.3
	Important	7	11.7	19.4	27.8
	Very Important	14	23.3	38.9	66.7
	Extremely Important	12	20.0	33.3	100.0
	Total	36	60.0	100.0	
Missing	System	24	40.0		
Total		60	100.0		

Item 23 examined the importance of the candidate's stated educational philosophy. It has a mean of 3.50 for principals from the lower SES school districts and a mean of 3.19 for principals from the higher SES districts. Three point six percent of the principals from the lower SES school districts rated stated educational philosophy as not important, 14.3% rated t as somewhat important, 35.7%

rated it as important, 21.4% rated it as very important, and 25% rated the candidate's stated educational philosophy as extremely important (See able 55).

Table 55

Item 23. When making hiring decisions, how important is the candidate's stated educational philosophy to principals in lower SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	1	1.7	3.6	3.6
	Somewhat Important	4	6.7	14.3	17.9
	Important	10	16.7	35.7	53.6
	Very Important	6	10.0	21.4	75.0
	Extremely Important	7	11.7	25.0	100.0
	Total	28	46.7	100.0	
Missing	System	32	53.3		
Total		60	100.0		

In the higher SES school districts, 5.6% of the principals rated the candidate's stated educational philosophy as not important. Nineteen point four percent of this same group of principals rated a candidate's stated educational philosophy as somewhat important, 38.9% rated it as important, 22.2% rated it as very important, and 13.9% rated it as extremely important (See Table 56).

Table 56

Item 23. When making hiring decisions, how important is the candidate's stated educational philosophy to principals in higher SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	2	3.3	5.6	5.6
	Somewhat Important	7	11.7	19.4	25.0
	Important	14	23.3	38.9	63.9
	Very Important	8	13.3	22.2	86.1
	Extremely Important	5	8.3	13.9	100.0
	Total	36	60.0	100.0	
Missing	System	24	40.0		
Total		60	100.0		

A comparison of the means between the principals from the lower SES and higher SES school districts was conducted by using independent samples T-Tests. The results for items 20 through 23 are listed in Table 57.

Table 57

Independent Samples T-Test for Items 20 through 23

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means				
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
Q20	Equal variances assumed	2.772	.101	-2.378	62	.021	-.61	.255
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.428	61.511	.018	-.61	.250
Q21	Equal variances assumed	1.824	.182	-2.634	62	.011	-.75	.286
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.682	61.193	.009	-.75	.281
Q22	Equal variances assumed	3.240	.077	-.227	62	.821	-.05	.228
	Equal variances not assumed			-.236	61.772	.814	-.05	.219
Q23	Equal variances assumed	.446	.507	1.091	62	.280	.31	.280
	Equal variances not assumed			1.085	56.927	.283	.31	.282

Table 57 describes the comparison of the means between principals from lower and higher SES school districts for items 20 through 23. The data suggests two statistically significant differences exist with a significance level of $p<.050$. Item 20 has a *t* value of (-2.378) and is significant at the .021 level based on Levene's Test of Equality since the variances in each SES group do not differ significantly from each other (p=.101). Item 21

was also statistically significant with a *t* value of (-2.634) and is significant at the .011 level both based on Levene's Test of Equality since the variances in each SES group do not differ significantly from each other (p=.182). Therefore, an equality of the variance can be assumed for both items and the t-tests remain as reported. This data would suggest that under Section One of the survey (Perceived Intelligence), a statistically significant difference exists between principals from the lower SES school districts and the higher SES school districts with respect to the importance of *Overall College Grade Point Average* and *Education Course Work Grade Point Average*.

Item 20 had a negative *t* value (-2.378) which would suggest that principals from the higher SES school districts placed a greater importance on the overall college grade point average than the principals from the lower SES school districts. Item 21 also had a negative *t* value (-2.634) which would suggest that principals from the higher SES school districts placed a greater importance on educational course work grade point average than the principals from the lower SES school districts.

Survey Responses to Items 24 Through 26

Items 24 through 26 in Section One of the survey measured the importance of professional relationships. All

sixty-four respondents answered items 24 and 25. One principal from the higher SES school districts did not answer item 26 (See Table 58).

Table 58

Group Statistics for Items 24 through 26

	SES	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Q24	Low SES	28	4.39	.875	.165
	High SES	36	4.69	.889	.148
Q25	Low SES	28	4.89	.497	.094
	High SES	36	4.89	.785	.131
Q26	Low SES	28	4.79	.630	.119
	High SES	35	4.74	.817	.138

Item 24 examined the importance of the candidate's ability to interact with other teachers. It has a mean of 4.39 for principals from the lower SES school districts and a mean of 4.69 for principals from the higher SES districts. None of the principals in the lower SES school districts rated a candidate's ability to interact with other teachers as not important or somewhat important, 14.3% rated it as important, 42.9% rated it as very important, and 32.1% rated it as extremely important. Three teachers (10.7%) were unable to determine a candidate's ability to interact with other teachers based on an interview (See Table 59).

Table 59

Item 24. When making hiring decisions, how important is the candidate's ability to interact with other teachers to principals in lower SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Important	4	6.7	14.3	14.3
	Very Important	12	20.0	42.9	57.1
	Extremely Important	9	15.0	32.1	89.3
	Unable to determine	3	5.0	10.7	100.0
	Total	28	46.7	100.0	
Missing	System	32	53.3		
Total		60	100.0		

In the higher SES school districts, none of the principals in the higher SES school districts rated a candidate's ability to interact with other teachers as somewhat important or important. Two point eight percent rated it as not important, 30.6% rated it as very important, and 55.6% rated it as extremely important. Four principals from the high SES school districts were unable to determine a candidate's ability to interact with other teachers based on an interview (See Table 60)

Table 60

Item 24. When making hiring decisions, how important is the candidate's ability to interact with other teachers to principals in higher SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	1	1.7	2.8	2.8
	Very Important	11	18.3	30.6	33.3
	Extremely Important	20	33.3	55.6	88.9
	Unable to determine	4	6.7	11.1	100.0
	Total	36	60.0	100.0	
Missing	System	24	40.0		
Total		60	100.0		

Item 25 examined the importance of the candidate's ability to interact with students. It has a mean of 4.89 for principals from the lower SES school districts and a mean of 4.89 for principals from the higher SES districts. None of the principals in the lower SES school districts rated a candidate's ability to interact with students as not important or important, 17.9% rated it as very important and 75% rated it as extremely important. Two of the principals from the lower SES school districts (7.1%) were unable to determine a candidate's ability to interact with students based on an interview (See Table 61).

Table 61

Item 25. When making hiring decisions, how important is the candidate's ability to interact with students to principals in lower SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Important	5	8.3	17.9	17.9
	Extremely Important	21	35.0	75.0	92.9
	Unable to determine	2	3.3	7.1	100.0
	Total	28	46.7	100.0	
Missing	System	32	53.3		
Total		60	100.0		

None of the principals in the higher SES school districts rated a candidate's ability to interact with students as somewhat important or important. One principal (2.8%) rated it as not important, 8.3% rated it as very important, and 80.6% rated it as extremely important. Three principals (8.3%) were unable to determine a candidate's ability to interact with students based on an interview (See Table 62).

Table 62

Item 25. When making hiring decisions, how important is the candidate's ability to interact with students to principals in higher SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	1	1.7	2.8	2.8
	Very Important	3	5.0	8.3	11.1
	Extremely Important	29	48.3	80.6	91.7
	Unable to determine	3	5.0	8.3	100.0
	Total	36	60.0	100.0	
Missing	System	24	40.0		
Total		60	100.0		

Item 26 examined the importance of the candidate's ability to interact with parents. It has a mean of 4.79 for principals from the lower SES school districts and a mean of 4.74 for principals from the higher SES districts. None of the principals in the lower SES school districts rated a candidate's ability to interact with parents as not important or somewhat important. Three point six percent rated it as important, 21.4% rated it as very important, and 67.9% rated it as extremely important. Two principals (7.1%) were unable to determine a candidate's ability to interact with parents based on an interview (See Table 63).

Table 63

Item 26. When making hiring decisions, how important is the candidate's ability to interact with parents to principals in lower SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Important	1	1.7	3.6	3.6
	Very Important	6	10.0	21.4	25.0
	Extremely Important	19	31.7	67.9	92.9
	Unable to determine	2	3.3	7.1	100.0
	Total	28	46.7	100.0	
Missing	System	32	53.3		
Total		60	100.0		

None of the principals in the higher SES school districts rated a candidate's ability to interact with students as somewhat important or important. Two point nine percent rated the ability to interact with parents as not important, 20.0% rated it as very important, and 71.4% rated it as extremely important. Two principals (5.7%) were not able to determine the interaction between a candidate and parents based on the interview. One principal, in the higher SES school districts, did not respond to this item (See Table 64).

Table 64

Item 26. When making hiring decisions, how important is the candidate's ability to interact with parents to principals in higher SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	1	1.7	2.9	2.9
	Very Important	7	11.7	20.0	22.9
	Extremely Important	25	41.7	71.4	94.3
	Unable to determine	2	3.3	5.7	100.0
	Total	35	58.3	100.0	
Missing	System	25	41.7		
Total		60	100.0		

Independent samples t-tests were run for these three items. The results of the independent samples T-Tests for items 24 through 26 are listed in Table 65.

Table 65

Independent Samples T-Test for Items 24 through 26

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means				
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
Q24	Equal variances assumed	.569	.453	-1.356	62	.180	-.30	.222
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.358	58.598	.180	-.30	.222
Q25	Equal variances assumed	.097	.756	.023	62	.981	.00	.170
	Equal variances not assumed			.025	59.807	.980	.00	.161
Q26	Equal variances assumed	.114	.737	.228	61	.820	.04	.188
	Equal variances not assumed			.235	60.935	.815	.04	.182

Table 65 describes the comparison of the means between principals from lower and higher SES school districts for items 24 through 26. The data suggests that there were no statistically significant differences at the $p<.050$ level. In the section of the survey devoted to professional relationships, there were no statistically significant differences between the principals from the lower SES school districts and the principals from the higher SES school districts.

Survey Responses to Items 27 Through 33

Items 27 through 33 examined the candidate's knowledge of instructional methods. All sixty-four principals responded to items 27 through 32 and one principals from the higher SES school districts did not respond to item 33 (See Table 66).

Table 66

Group Statistics for Items 27 through 33

	SES	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Q27	Low SES	28	4.57	.573	.108
	High SES	36	4.42	.906	.151
Q28	Low SES	28	4.68	.548	.104
	High SES	36	4.50	.910	.152
Q29	Low SES	28	4.00	.609	.115
	High SES	36	4.03	.878	.146
Q30	Low SES	28	3.96	.838	.158
	High SES	36	3.72	.974	.162
Q31	Low SES	28	4.32	.723	.137
	High SES	36	4.28	.974	.162
Q32	Low SES	28	4.11	.786	.149
	High SES	36	3.50	1.159	.193
Q33	Low SES	28	3.79	.738	.140
	High SES	35	3.77	.770	.130

Item 27 examined the importance of a candidate's ability to use varied instructional strategies. It has a

mean of 4.57 for principals from the lower SES school districts and a mean of 4.52 for principals from the higher SES districts. None of the principals in the lower SES school districts rated a candidate's ability to use varied instructional strategies as not important, somewhat important, or important. Forty-six point four percent rated it as very important and 50% rated it as extremely important. One principal (3.6%) was unable to determine a candidate's ability to use varied instructional strategies based on an interview (See Table 67).

Table 67

Item 27. When making hiring decisions, how important is the candidate's ability to use varied instructional strategies to principals in lower SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Important	13	21.7	46.4	46.4
	Extremely Important	14	23.3	50.0	96.4
	Unable to determine	1	1.7	3.6	100.0
	Total	28	46.7	100.0	
Missing	System	32	53.3		
Total		60	100.0		

None of the principals in the higher SES school districts rated a candidate's ability to use varied

instructional strategies as somewhat important. Two point eight percent rated it as not important, 8.3% rated it as important, 33.3% rated it as very important, and 52.8% rated it as extremely important. One principal (2.8%) was unable to determine a candidate's ability to use varied instructional strategies based on an interview (See Table 68).

Table 68

Item 27. When making hiring decisions, how important is the candidate's ability to use varied instructional strategies to principals in higher SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	1	1.7	2.8	2.8
	Important	3	5.0	8.3	11.1
	Very Important	12	20.0	33.3	44.4
	Extremely Important	19	31.7	52.8	97.2
	Unable to determine	1	1.7	2.8	100.0
	Total	36	60.0	100.0	
Missing	System	24	40.0		
Total		60	100.0		

Item 28 examined the importance of a candidate's ability to use effective classroom management techniques. It has a mean of 4.68 for principals from the lower SES

school districts and a mean of 4.50 for principals from the higher SES districts. None of the principals in the lower SES school districts rated a candidate's ability to use effective classroom management techniques as not important, somewhat important, or important. Thirty-five point seven percent rated it as very important and 60.7% rated it as extremely important. One principal (3.6%) was unable to determine a candidate's ability to use effective classroom management techniques based on an interview (See Table 69).

Table 69

Item 28. When making hiring decisions, how important is the candidate's ability to use effective classroom management techniques to principals in lower SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Important	10	16.7	35.7	35.7
	Extremely Important	17	28.3	60.7	96.4
	Unable to determine	1	1.7	3.6	100.0
	Total	28	46.7	100.0	
Missing	System	32	53.3		
Total		60	100.0		

None of the principals in the higher SES school districts rated a candidate's ability to use effective classroom techniques as somewhat important. Two point

eight percent rated it as not important, 8.3% rated it as important, 25% rated it as very important, and 61.6% rated it as extremely important. One principal (2.8%) was unable to determine a candidate's ability to use effective classroom management techniques based on an interview (See Table 70).

Table 70

Item 28. When making hiring decisions, how important is the candidate's ability to use effective classroom management techniques to principals in higher SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	1	1.7	2.8	2.8
	Important	3	5.0	8.3	11.1
	Very Important	9	15.0	25.0	36.1
	Extremely Important	22	36.7	61.1	97.2
	Unable to determine	1	1.7	2.8	100.0
	Total	36	60.0	100.0	
Missing	System	24	40.0		
Total		60	100.0		

Item 29 examined the importance of a candidate's ability to pace a lesson. It has a mean of 4.00 for principals from the lower SES school districts and a mean of 4.03 for principals from the higher SES districts. None of the

principals in the lower SES school districts rated a candidate's ability to pace a lesson as not important or somewhat important. Fourteen point three percent rated it as important, 75% rated it as very important, and 7.1% rated it as extremely important. One principal (3.6%) was unable to determine a candidate's ability to pace a lesson based on an interview (See Table 71).

Table 71

Item 29. When making hiring decisions, how important is the candidate's ability to pace a lesson to principals in lower SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Important	4	6.7	14.3	14.3
	Very Important	21	35.0	75.0	89.3
	Extremely Important	2	3.3	7.1	96.4
	Unable to determine	1	1.7	3.6	100.0
	Total	28	46.7	100.0	
Missing	System	32	53.3		
Total		60	100.0		

None of the principals in the higher SES school districts rated a candidate's ability to pace a lesson as not important. Two point eight percent rated it as somewhat important, 22.2% rated it as important, 50% rated it as very important, and 19.4% rated it as extremely

important. Two principals (5.6%) were unable to determine a candidate's ability to pace a lesson based on an interview (See Table 72).

Table 72

Item 29. When making hiring decisions, how important is the candidate's ability to pace a lesson to principals in higher SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Important	1	1.7	2.8	2.8
	Important	8	13.3	22.2	25.0
	Very Important	18	30.0	50.0	75.0
	Extremely Important	7	11.7	19.4	94.4
	Unable to determine	2	3.3	5.6	100.0
	Total	36	60.0	100.0	
Missing	System	24	40.0		
Total		60	100.0		

Item 30 examined the importance of a candidate's ability to write effective lesson plans. It has a mean of 3.96 for principals from the lower SES school districts and a mean of 3.72 for principals from the higher SES districts. None of the principals in the lower SES school districts rated a candidate's ability to write effective lesson plans as not important or somewhat important. Thirty-two point one

percent rated it as important, 42.9% rated it as very important, and 21.4% rated it as extremely important. One principal (3.6%) was unable to determine a candidate's ability to write effective lesson plans based on an interview (See Table 73).

Table 73

Item 30. When making hiring decisions, how important is the candidate's ability to write effective lesson plans to principals in lower SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Important	9	15.0	32.1	32.1
	Very Important	12	20.0	42.9	75.0
	Extremely Important	6	10.0	21.4	96.4
	Unable to determine	1	1.7	3.6	100.0
	Total	28	46.7	100.0	
Missing	System	32	53.3		
Total		60	100.0		

Two point eight percent of the principals in the higher SES school districts rated a candidate's ability to effectively write lesson plans as not important. Two point eight percent of this same group of principals rated it as somewhat important, 36.1% rated it as important, 38.9% rated it as very important, and 16.7% rated it as extremely

important. One principal (2.8%) was unable to determine a candidate's ability to write effective lesson plans based on an interview (See Table 74).

Table 74

Item 30. When making hiring decisions, how important is the candidate's ability to write effective lesson plans to principals in higher SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	1	1.7	2.8	2.8
	Somewhat Important	1	1.7	2.8	5.6
	Important	13	21.7	36.1	41.7
	Very Important	14	23.3	38.9	80.6
	Extremely Important	6	10.0	16.7	97.2
	Unable to determine	1	1.7	2.8	100.0
	Total	36	60.0	100.0	
Missing	System	24	40.0		
Total		60	100.0		

Item 31 examined the importance of a candidate's ability to use assessment to guide instruction. It has a mean of 4.32 for principals from the lower SES school districts and a mean of 4.28 for principals from the higher SES districts. None of the principals in the lower SES school districts rated a candidate's ability to use

assessment to guide instruction as not important or somewhat important. Ten point seven percent rated it as important, 50% rated it as very important, and 35.7% rated it as extremely important. One principal (3.6%) was unable to determine a candidate's ability to use assessment to guide instruction based on an interview (See Table 75).

Table 75

Item 31. When making hiring decisions, how important is the candidate's ability to use assessment to guide instruction to principals in lower SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Important	3	5.0	10.7	10.7
	Very Important	14	23.3	50.0	60.7
	Extremely Important	10	16.7	35.7	96.4
	Unable to determine	1	1.7	3.6	100.0
	Total	28	46.7	100.0	
Missing	System	32	53.3		
Total		60	100.0		

None of the principals in the higher SES school districts rated a candidate's ability to use assessment to guide instruction as somewhat important. Two point eight percent rated it as not important, 13.9% rated it as important, 38.9% rated it as very important, and 38.9%

rated it as extremely important. Two principals (5.6%) were unable to determine a candidate's ability to use assessment to guide instruction based on an interview (See Table 76).

Table 76

Item 31. When making hiring decisions, how important is the candidate's ability to use assessment to guide instruction to principals in higher SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	1	1.7	2.8	2.8
	Important	5	8.3	13.9	16.7
	Very Important	14	23.3	38.9	55.6
	Extremely Important	14	23.3	38.9	94.4
	Unable to determine	2	3.3	5.6	100.0
	Total	36	60.0	100.0	
Missing	System	24	40.0		
Total		60	100.0		

Item 32 examined the importance of a candidate's ability to celebrate diversity. It has a mean of 4.11 for principals from the lower SES school districts and a mean of 3.50 for principals from the higher SES districts. None of the principals in the lower SES school districts rated a candidate's ability to celebrate diversity as not important

or somewhat important. Twenty-five percent rated it as important, 39.3% rated it as very important, and 35.7% rated it as extremely important (See Table 77).

Table 77

Item 32. When making hiring decisions, how important is the candidate's ability to celebrate diversity to principals in lower SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Important	7	11.7	25.0	25.0
	Very Important	11	18.3	39.3	64.3
	Extremely Important	10	16.7	35.7	100.0
	Total	28	46.7	100.0	
Missing	System	32	53.3		
Total		60	100.0		

All of the principals in the higher SES school districts responded to item 32. Eight point three percent of these principals rated a candidate's ability to celebrate diversity as not important, 8.3% rated it as somewhat important, 27.8% rated it as important, 36.1% rated it as very important, and 19.4% rated it as extremely important (See Table 78).

Table 78

Item 32. When making hiring decisions, how important is the candidate's ability to celebrate diversity to principals in higher SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	3	5.0	8.3	8.3
	Somewhat Important	3	5.0	8.3	16.7
	Important	10	16.7	27.8	44.4
	Very Important	13	21.7	36.1	80.6
	Extremely Important	7	11.7	19.4	100.0
	Total	36	60.0	100.0	
Missing	System	24			
Total		60	100.0		

Item 33 examined the importance of a candidate's ability to integrate technology into the classroom. It has a mean of 3.79 for principals from the lower SES school districts and a mean of 3.77 for principals from the higher SES districts. None of the principals in the lower SES school districts rated a candidate's ability to integrate technology into the classroom as not important. Three point six percent rated it as somewhat important, 28.6% rated it as important, 53.6% rated it as very important, and 14.3% rated it as extremely important (See Table 79).

Table 79

Item 33. When making hiring decisions, how important is the candidate's ability to integrate technology into the classroom to principals in lower SES school districts?

			Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Important	1	1.7	3.6	3.6
	Important	8	13.3	28.6	32.1
	Very Important	15	25.0	53.6	85.7
	Extremely Important	4	6.7	14.3	100.0
	Total	28	46.7	100.0	
Missing	System	32	53.3		
Total		60	100.0		

None of the principals in the higher SES school districts rated a candidate's ability to integrate technology into the classroom as somewhat important. Two point nine percent rated it as not important, 25.7% rated it as important, 60.0% rated it as very important, and 11.4% rated it as extremely important. One principal from the higher SES school districts did not respond to item 33 (See Table 80).

Table 80

Item 33. When making hiring decisions, how important is the candidate's ability to integrate technology into the classroom to principals in higher SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	1	1.7	2.9	2.9
	Important	9	15.0	25.7	28.6
	Very Important	21	35.0	60.0	88.6
	Extremely Important	4	6.7	11.4	100.0
	Total	35	58.3	100.0	
Missing	System	25	41.7		
Total		60	100.0		

A comparison of the means between the principals from the lower SES and higher SES school districts was conducted by using independent T-Tests. The results for items 27 through 33 are listed in Table 81.

Table 81

Independent Samples T-Test for Items 27 through 33

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means				
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
Q27	Equal variances assumed	2.459	.122	.789	62	.433	.15	.196
	Equal variances not assumed			.833	59.750	.408	.15	.186
Q28	Equal variances assumed	3.263	.076	.916	62	.363	.18	.195
	Equal variances not assumed			.972	58.695	.335	.18	.184
Q29	Equal variances assumed	4.337	.041	-.143	62	.887	-.03	.195
	Equal variances not assumed			-.149	61.285	.882	-.03	.186
Q30	Equal variances assumed	1.070	.305	1.047	62	.299	.24	.231
	Equal variances not assumed			1.067	61.324	.290	.24	.227
Q31	Equal variances assumed	1.291	.260	.198	62	.843	.04	.220
	Equal variances not assumed			.206	61.888	.838	.04	.212
Q32	Equal variances assumed	4.552	.037	2.378	62	.021	.61	.255
	Equal variances not assumed			2.492	60.989	.015	.61	.244
Q33	Equal variances assumed	.029	.864	.075	61	.941	.01	.192
	Equal variances not assumed			.075	58.982	.941	.01	.191

Table 81 describes the comparison of the means between principals from lower and higher SES school districts for items 27 through 33. The data suggests that one statistically significant difference exists with a significance level of $p<.050$. Item 32 has a t value of (2.378) and is significant at the .021 level if equal variances could be assumed. This data would suggest that under Section One of the survey (Knowledge of Instructional Methods), a statistically significant difference exists between principals from the lower SES school districts and the higher SES school districts with respect to the importance of the ability to celebrate diversity.

For item 32, Levene's Test for Equality of Variances was conducted and was found to be statistically significant with item 32 ($F=4.552$, $p=.037$). Therefore an equality of variance cannot be assumed. Because equal variances are not assumed it will be necessary to use the slightly less powerful unequal variance T-Test. Item 32 would then have a t value of (2.492) and would still be significant at the .015 level. Since a weaker test is being used to it will be important to look at the squared point biserial correlation coefficient so that the size of the effect can be measured.

Witte and Witte (2001) define squared point biserial correlation coefficient "as the proportion (from 0 to 1) of variance in the dependent variable that is predictable from, or explained by the independent variable" (p. 355). The squared point biserial correlation coefficient for item 32 is (r^2_{pb} = .0924). Cohen, as cited by Witte and Witte, suggests that the estimated effect (estimated difference between population means) is small if in the vicinity of .01, medium if in the vicinity of .06, and large if in the vicinity of .14 (pp. 356-357). With a squared point biserial correlation coefficient of .0924 the effect of the SES status of the district where the principal worked, would have a medium effect on the importance of the ability to celebrate diversity.

Item 32 had a positive *t* value (2.378) which would suggest that principals from the lower SES school districts placed a greater importance on the ability to celebrate diversity than the principals from the lower SES school districts.

Survey Responses to Items 34 Through 40

Items 34 through 40 examined the hiring procedures used by the principals in this study. All sixty-four principals answered items 34, 35, 36, 37, 39, and 40. One

principal from the lower SES school districts did not answer item 38 (See Table 82).

Table 82

Group Statistics for Items 34 through 40

	SES	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Q34	Low SES	28	4.32	.863	.163
	High SES	36	4.42	.841	.140
Q35	Low SES	28	3.18	.945	.179
	High SES	36	3.39	1.178	.196
Q36	Low SES	28	4.71	.460	.087
	High SES	36	4.53	.845	.141
Q37	Low SES	28	4.18	1.362	.257
	High SES	36	3.36	1.437	.240
Q38	Low SES	27	4.41	1.394	.268
	High SES	36	4.08	1.204	.201
Q39	Low SES	28	4.11	1.031	.195
	High SES	36	3.72	.944	.157
Q40	Low SES	28	2.96	.922	.174
	High SES	36	3.03	1.000	.167

Item 34 examined the importance of checking a candidate's professional references. It has a mean of 4.32 for principals from the lower SES school districts and a mean of 4.42 for principals from the higher SES districts. None of the principals in the lower SES school districts rated the importance of checking a candidate's professional

references as not important. Three point six percent rated it as somewhat important, 14.3% rated it as important, 28.6% rated it as very important, and 53.6% rated it as extremely important (See Table 83).

Table 83

Item 34. When making hiring decisions, how important is checking the candidate's professional references to principals in lower SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Important	1	1.7	3.6	3.6
	Important	4	6.7	14.3	17.9
	Very Important	8	13.3	28.6	46.4
	Extremely Important	15	25.0	53.6	100.0
	Total	28	46.7	100.0	
Missing	System	32	53.3		
Total		60	100.0		

None of the principals in the higher SES school districts rated the importance of checking a candidate's professional references as somewhat important. Two point eight percent rated it as not important, 5.6% percent rated it as important, 36.1% rated it as very important, and 55.6% rated it as extremely important (See Table 84).

Table 84

Item 34. When making hiring decisions, how important is checking the candidate's professional references to principals in higher SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	1	1.7	2.8	2.8
	Important	2	3.3	5.6	8.3
	Very Important	13	21.7	36.1	44.4
	Extremely Important	20	33.3	55.6	100.0
	Total	36	60.0	100.0	
Missing	System	24	40.0		
Total		60	100.0		

Item 35 examined the importance of checking a candidate's personal references. It has a mean of 3.18 for principals from the lower SES school districts and a mean of 3.39 for principals from the higher SES districts. Three point six percent of the principals in the lower SES school districts rated the importance of checking a candidate's professional references as not important. Seventeen point nine percent rated it as somewhat important, 42.9% rated it as important, 28.6% rated it as very important, and 7.1% rated it as extremely important (See Table 85).

Table 85

Item 35. When making hiring decisions, how important is checking the candidate's personal references to principals in lower SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	1	1.7	3.6	3.6
	Somewhat Important	5	8.3	17.9	21.4
	Important	12	20.0	42.9	64.3
	Very Important	8	13.3	28.6	92.9
	Extremely Important	2	3.3	7.1	100.0
	Total	28	46.7	100.0	
Missing	System	32	53.3		
Total		60	100.0		

Two point eight percent of the principals in the higher SES school districts rated the importance of checking a candidate's personal references as not important, 25.0% rated it as somewhat important, 22.2% rated it as important, 33.3% rated it as very important, and 13.9% rated it as extremely important. One principal from the higher SES school districts reported that they do not check personal references (See Table 86).

Table 86

Item 35. When making hiring decisions, how important is checking the candidate's personal references to principals in higher SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	1	1.7	2.8	2.8
	Somewhat Important	9	15.0	25.0	27.8
	Important	8	13.3	22.2	50.0
	Very Important	12	20.0	33.3	83.3
	Extremely Important	5	8.3	13.9	97.2
	Procedure not used	1	1.7	2.8	100.0
	Total	36	60.0	100.0	
Missing	System	24	40.0		
Total		60	100.0		

Item 36 examined the importance of a candidate's oral responses in an interview. It has a mean of 4.71 for principals from the lower SES school districts and a mean of 4.53 for principals from the higher SES districts. None of the principals in the lower SES school districts rated the importance of a candidate's oral responses in an interview as not important, somewhat important, or important. Twenty-eight point six percent rated it as very important, and 71.4% rated it as extremely important (See Table 87).

Table 87

Item 36. When making hiring decisions, how important are the candidate's oral responses in an interview to principals in lower SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Important	8	13.3	28.6	28.6
	Extremely Important	20	33.3	71.4	100.0
	Total	28	46.7	100.0	
Missing	System	32	53.3		
Total		60	100.0		

None of the principals in the higher SES school districts rated the importance of a candidate's oral responses as somewhat important. Two point eight percent rated it as not important, 5.6% rated it as important, 25% rated it as very important, and 66.7% rated it as extremely important (See Table 88).

Table 88

Item 36. When making hiring decisions, how important are the candidate's oral responses in an interview to principals in higher SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	1	1.7	2.8	2.8
	Important	2	3.3	5.6	8.3
	Very Important	9	15.0	25.0	33.3
	Extremely Important	24	40.0	66.7	100.0
	Total	36	60.0	100.0	
Missing	System	24	40.0		
Total		60	100.0		

Item 37 examined the importance of checking a candidate's essay responses to a written prompt. It has a mean of 4.18 for principals from the lower SES school districts and a mean of 3.36 for principals from the higher SES districts. Three point six percent of the principals in the lower SES school districts rated the importance of checking a candidate's written responses to an essay as not important, 3.6% percent rated it as somewhat important, 28.6% rated it as important, 21.4% rated it as very important, and 21.4% rated it as extremely important. Six principals in the lower SES school districts do not use the procedure of soliciting answers to an essay (See Table 89).

Table 89

Item 37. *When making hiring decisions, how important are the candidate's essay responses to a written prompt to principals in lower SES school districts?*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	1	1.7	3.6	3.6
	Somewhat Important	1	1.7	3.6	7.1
	Important	8	13.3	28.6	35.7
	Very Important	6	10.0	21.4	57.1
	Extremely Important	6	10.0	21.4	78.6
	Procedure not used	6	10.0	21.4	100.0
	Total	28	46.7	100.0	
Missing	System	32	53.3		
Total		60	100.0		

Six point seven percent of the principals in the higher SES school districts rated the importance of a candidate's written responses to an essay as not important. Sixteen point seven percent rated it as somewhat important, 25.0% rated it as important, 30.6% rated it as very important, and 5.6% rated it as extremely important. Four principals (11.1%) in the higher SES school districts do not solicit answers to written essays (See Table 90).

Table 90

Item 37. *When making hiring decisions, how important are the candidate's essay responses to a written prompt to principals in higher SES school districts?*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	4	6.7	11.1	11.1
	Somewhat Important	6	10.0	16.7	27.8
	Important	9	15.0	25.0	52.8
	Very Important	11	18.3	30.6	83.3
	Extremely Important	2	3.3	5.6	88.9
	Procedure not used	4	6.7	11.1	100.0
	Total	36	60.0	100.0	
Missing	System	24	40.0		
Total		60	100.0		

Item 38 examined the importance of a candidate's conducted demonstration lesson. It has a mean of 4.41 for principals from the lower SES school districts and a mean of 4.08 for principals from the higher SES districts. None of the principals in the lower SES school districts rated the importance of a candidate's conducted demonstration lesson as not important, 7.4% rated it as somewhat important, 25.9% rated it as important, 18.5% rated it as very important, and 14.8% rated it as extremely important. Nine principals (33.3%) in the lower SES school districts

do not include demonstration lessons as a procedure used for hiring (See Table 91).

Table 91

Item 38. When making hiring decisions, how important is a candidate conducted demonstration lesson to principals in lower SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Important	2	3.3	7.4	7.4
	Important	7	11.7	25.9	33.3
	Very Important	5	8.3	18.5	51.9
	Extremely Important	4	6.7	14.8	66.7
	Procedure not used	9	15.0	33.3	100.0
	Total	27	45.0	100.0	
Missing	System	33	55.0		
Total		60	100.0		

Five point six percent of the principals in the higher SES school districts rated the importance of a candidate's conducted demonstration lesson as not important, 5.6% rated it as somewhat important, 13.9% rated it as important, 27.8% rated it as very important, and 44.4% rated it as extremely important. One principal (2.8%) did not use a demonstration lesson as a hiring procedure (See Table 92).

Table 92

Item 38. When making hiring decisions, how important is a candidate conducted demonstration lesson to principals in higher SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	2	3.3	5.6	5.6
	Somewhat Important	2	3.3	5.6	11.1
	Important	5	8.3	13.9	25.0
	Very Important	10	16.7	27.8	52.8
	Extremely Important	16	26.7	44.4	97.2
	Procedure not used	1	1.7	2.8	100.0
	Total	36	60.0	100.0	
Missing	System	24	40.0		
Total		60	100.0		

Item 39 examined the importance of screening a candidate's resume for a match to a position. It has a mean of 4.11 for principals from the lower SES school districts and a mean of 3.72 for principals from the higher SES districts. None of the principals in the lower SES school districts rated the importance of screening a candidate's resume as somewhat important, 3.6% percent rated it as not important, 25.0% rated it as important, 25.0% rated it as very important, and 46.4% rated it as extremely important (See Table 93).

Table 93

Item 39. When making hiring decisions, how important is screening a resume for a match to the position to principals in lower SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	1	1.7	3.6	3.6
	Important	7	11.7	25.0	28.6
	Very Important	7	11.7	25.0	53.6
	Extremely Important	13	21.7	46.4	100.0
	Total	28	46.7	100.0	
Missing	System	32	53.3		
Total		60	100.0		

None of the principals in the higher SES school districts rated the importance of screening a candidate's resume as somewhat important. Two point eight percent rated it as not important, 44.4% rated it as important, 27.8% rated it as very important, and 25.0% rated it as extremely important (See Table 94).

Table 94

Item 39. When making hiring decisions, how important is screening a resume for a match to the position to principals in higher SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	1	1.7	2.8	2.8
	Important	16	26.7	44.4	47.2
	Very Important	10	16.7	27.8	75.0
	Extremely Important	9	15.0	25.0	100.0
	Total	36	60.0	100.0	
Missing	System	24	40.0		
Total		60	100.0		

Item 40 examined the importance of the information contained in a candidate's cover letter. It has a mean of 2.96 for principals from the lower SES school districts and a mean of 3.03 for principals from the higher SES districts. None of the principals in the lower SES school districts rated the importance of the information contained in a candidate's cover letter as extremely important. Seven point one percent rated it as not important, 21.4% rated it as somewhat important, 39.3%% rated it as important, and 32.1% rated it as very important (See Table 95).

Table 95

Item 40. When making hiring decisions, how important is the information contained in the cover letter to principals in lower SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	2	3.3	7.1	7.1
	Somewhat Important	6	10.0	21.4	28.6
	Important	11	18.3	39.3	67.9
	Very Important	9	15.0	32.1	100.0
	Total	28	46.7	100.0	
Missing	System	32	53.3		
Total		60	100.0		

Eight point three percent of the principals in the higher SES school districts rated the importance of the information contained in a candidate's cover letter as not important. Nineteen point four percent rated it as somewhat important, 36.1% rated it as important, 33.3% rated it as very important, and 2.8% rated it as extremely important (See Table 96).

Table 96

Item 40. When making hiring decisions, how important is the information contained in the cover letter to principals in higher SES school districts?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Important	3	5.0	8.3	8.3
	Somewhat Important	7	11.7	19.4	27.8
	Important	13	21.7	36.1	63.9
	Very Important	12	20.0	33.3	97.2
	Extremely Important	1	1.7	2.8	100.0
	Total	36	60.0	100.0	
Missing	System	24	40.0		
Total		60	100.0		

A comparison of the means between principals from lower and higher SES school districts was conducted using independent samples T-Tests. The results of these tests are listed in Table 97.

Table 97

Independent Samples T-Test for Items 34 through 40

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means				
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
Q34	Equal variances assumed	.407	.526	-.444	62	.658	-.10	.214
	Equal variances not assumed			-.443	57.439	.660	-.10	.215
Q35	Equal variances assumed	3.282	.075	-.771	62	.444	-.21	.273
	Equal variances not assumed			-.793	61.924	.431	-.21	.265
Q36	Equal variances assumed	4.076	.048	1.052	62	.297	.19	.177
	Equal variances not assumed			1.127	56.192	.264	.19	.165
Q37	Equal variances assumed	.018	.895	2.309	62	.024	.82	.354
	Equal variances not assumed			2.325	59.554	.024	.82	.352
Q38	Equal variances assumed	3.199	.079	.988	61	.327	.32	.328
	Equal variances not assumed			.967	51.309	.338	.32	.335
Q39	Equal variances assumed	.070	.793	1.554	62	.125	.38	.248
	Equal variances not assumed			1.537	55.519	.130	.38	.250
Q40	Equal variances assumed	.167	.684	-.261	62	.795	-.06	.244
	Equal variances not assumed			-.263	60.146	.793	-.06	.241

Table 97 describes the comparison of the means between principals from lower and higher SES school districts for items 34 through 40. The data suggests that one statistically significant difference exists with a significance level of $p<.050$. Item 37 has a *t* value of (2.309) and is significant at the .024 level based on Levene's Test of Equality since the variances in each SES group do not differ significantly from each other (p=.895). Therefore an equality of the variance can be assumed and the t-test remains as reported. This data would suggest that under Section Two of the survey (Hiring Procedures), a statistically significant difference exists between principals from the lower SES school districts and the higher SES school districts with respect to the importance of *Essay Responses to a Written Prompt*.

Item 37 had a positive *t* value (2.309) which would suggest that principals from the lower SES school districts placed a greater importance on the essay responses to a written prompt than the principals from the higher SES school districts.

Survey Responses to Items 41 and 42

Items 41 and 42 examined how the principals in this study rated the methods they used and their effectiveness

in hiring new teachers. For both items, one principal from the lower SES school districts and one principal from the higher SES school districts did not respond to these items (See Table 98).

Table 98

Group Statistics for Items 41 and 42

	SES	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Q41	Low SES	27	3.81	.681	.131
	High SES	35	4.29	.572	.097
Q42	Low SES	27	4.07	.550	.106
	High SES	35	4.34	.639	.108

Item 41 examined how the principals in this study rated the methods they use for hiring new teachers. It has a mean of 3.81 for principals from the lower SES school districts and a mean of 4.29 for principals from the higher SES districts. None of the principals in the lower SES school districts rated the methods they used for hiring new teachers as not effective or somewhat effective. Thirty-three point three percent rated their methods as effective, 51.9% rated it as very effective, and 14.8% rated it as extremely effective. One principal from the lower SES school districts did not answer item 41 (See Table 99).

Table 99

Item 41. How do principals from the lower SES school districts rate the methods they use for hiring new teachers?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Effective	9	15.0	33.3	33.3
	Very Effective	14	23.3	51.9	85.2
	Extremely Effective	4	6.7	14.8	100.0
	Total	27	45.0	100.0	
Missing	System	33	55.0		
Total		60	100.0		

None of the principals in the higher SES school districts rated the methods they used for hiring new teachers as not effective or somewhat effective. Five point seven percent rated their methods as effective, 60.0% rated it as very effective, and 34.3% rated it as extremely effective. One principal from the higher SES school districts did not answer item 41 (See Table 100).

Table 100

Item 41. How do principals from the higher SES school districts rate the methods they use for hiring new teachers?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Effective	2	3.3	5.7	5.7
	Very Effective	21	35.0	60.0	65.7
	Extremely Effective	12	20.0	34.3	100.0
	Total	35	58.3	100.0	
Missing	System	25	41.7		
Total		60	100.0		

Item 42 examined how the principals in this study rated their effectiveness in hiring quality teachers. It has a mean of 4.07 for principals from the lower SES school districts and a mean of 4.34 for principals from the higher SES districts. None of the principals in the lower SES school districts rated their effectiveness in hiring quality teachers as not effective or somewhat effective. Eleven point one percent rated their methods as effective, 70.4% rated it as very effective, and 18.5% rated it as extremely effective. One principal from the lower SES school districts did not answer item 42 (See Table 101).

Table 101

Item 42. How do principals from the lower SES school districts rate their effectiveness in hiring quality teachers?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Effective	3	5.0	11.1	11.1
	Very Effective	19	31.7	70.4	81.5
	Extremely Effective	5	8.3	18.5	100.0
	Total	27	45.0	100.0	
Missing	System	33	55.0		
Total		60	100.0		

None of the principals in the higher SES school districts rated their effectiveness in hiring quality teachers as not effective or somewhat effective. Eight point six percent rated their methods as effective, 48.6% rated it as very effective, and 42.9% rated it as extremely effective. One principal from the lower SES school districts did not answer item 42 (See Table 102).

Table 102

Item 42. How do principals from the higher *SES school districts rate their effectiveness in hiring quality teachers?*

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Effective	3	5.0	8.6	8.6
	Very Effective	17	28.3	48.6	57.1
	Extremely Effective	15	25.0	42.9	100.0
	Total	35	58.3	100.0	
Missing	System	25	41.7		
Total		60	100.0		

A comparison of the means between the principals from the lower SES and higher SES school districts was conducted by using independent samples T-Tests. The results of these tests for items 41 and 42 are listed in Table 103.

Table 103

Independent Samples T-Test for Items 41 and 42

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means				
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
Q41	Equal variances assumed	.381	.540	-2.955	60	.004	-.47	.159
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.889	50.557	.006	-.47	.163
Q42	Equal variances assumed	5.953	.018	-1.743	60	.086	-.27	.154
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.778	59.241	.081	-.27	.151

Table 103 describes the comparison of the means between principals from lower and higher SES school districts for items 41 and 42. The data suggests one statistically significant differences exist with a significance level of $p<.050$. Item 41 has a *t* value of (-2.955) and is significant at the .004 level based on Levene's Test of Equality since the variances in each SES group do not differ significantly from each other (p=.540). Therefore an equality of the variances can be assumed and the t-test remains as reported. This data would suggest that under Section Three of the survey (Self Perceptions Regarding Hiring) a statistically significant difference exists between principals from the lower SES school districts and

the higher SES school districts with respect to how they *Rate the Methods They Use For Hiring New Teachers.*

Item 41 had a negative *t* value (-2.955) which would suggest that principals from the higher SES school districts rate the methods they use for hiring new teachers higher than the principals from the lower SES districts.

Effect Size for Significant Items 1 through 42

Witte and Witte (2001) state that "statistical significance indicates merely that the null hypothesis is probably false" (p. 354). Statistical significance does not indicate importance. To check for importance, the effect (difference between population means) must be examined (p. 355).

Witte and Witte (2001) suggest that one way to determine the importance of statistically significant result is to use the squared point biserial correlation coefficient. They define the squared point biserial correlation coefficient "as the proportion (from 0 to 1) of variance in the dependent variable that is predictable from, or explained by the independent variable" (Witte, 2001, p. 355). The squared point biserial correlation coefficient is an equation that is used to measure Effect Size. Cohen, as cited by Witte and Witte, suggests that the estimated effect (estimated difference between

population means) is small if in the vicinity of .01, medium if in the vicinity of .06, and large if in the vicinity of .14 (pp. 356-357). Table 104 lists the squared point biserial correlation coefficients for the statistically significant items between 1 and 42.

Table 104

Effect size for statistically significant differences (items 1 through 42)

Item	Trait/Criteria	r^2_{pb}	Effect Size
5	Creativity	.074	Medium
9	Values	.085	Medium
15	Multiple Certifications	.063	Medium
19	Teaching Experience	.047	Medium
20	Overall Grade Point Average	.084	Medium
21	Educational Grade Point Average	.101	Large
32	Ability to Celebrate Diversity	.092	Medium
37	Responses to Written Prompt	.079	Medium
41	Rating of Personal Methods Used	.127	Large

As can be seen in Table 104, of the nine traits or criteria that had statistically significant differences, none of them had a small effect size, seven had an effect size of medium, and the other two items had an effect size of large. Cohen (as cited by Witte and Witte, 2001)

describes a small effect size as could lack importance, a medium effect size as could have some importance, and a large effect size as probably has importance.

Summary of the Means for Items 1 through 40

One of the research questions for this study is to determine which teacher candidate qualities New Jersey elementary school principals deem most important. In each of the prior sections, group statistics were given which described the mean response for each item. To determine which qualities are most important this researchers has determined a mean response to an item from either SES group must be 4.50 or higher. Items that achieved a mean response of 4.50 or higher are listed in Table 104.

Table 105

Group Statistics for Items 1 through 40 that achieved a Mean of 4.50 or higher

	SES	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Q1	Low SES	28	4.54	.637	.120
	High SES	35	4.74	.817	.138
Q2	Low SES	28	4.79	.418	.079
	High SES	36	4.78	.760	.127
Q8	Low SES	28	4.64	.488	.092
	High SES	36	4.58	.906	.151
Q9	Low SES	27	3.96	.854	.164
	High SES	36	4.50	.910	.152
Q11	Low SES	28	4.68	.476	.090
	High SES	36	4.61	.838	.140
Q13	Low SES	28	4.75	.441	.083
	High SES	36	4.64	.798	.133
Q24	Low SES	28	4.39	.875	.165
	High SES	36	4.69	.889	.148
Q25	Low SES	28	4.89	.497	.094
	High SES	36	4.89	.785	.131
Q26	Low SES	28	4.79	.630	.119
	High SES	35	4.74	.817	.138
Q27	Low SES	28	4.57	.573	.108
	High SES	36	4.42	.906	.151
Q28	Low SES	28	4.68	.548	.104
	High SES	36	4.50	.910	.152
Q36	Low SES	28	4.71	.460	.087
	High SES	36	4.53	.845	.141

According to this criteria, principals from the lower SES school districts most value the following qualities when selecting new teachers:

Passion for teaching;

Positive attitude;

Ability to motivate;

Enthusiasm;

Ability to communicate;

Ability to interact with students;

Ability to interact with parents;

Ability to use varied instructional strategies;

Ability to use effective classroom management Techniques;

and Answer to oral responses in an interview.

Principals from the higher SES school districts most value the following qualities when selecting new teachers:

Passion for teaching;

Positive attitude;

Ability to motivate;

Values;

Enthusiasm;

Ability to communicate;

Ability to interact with other teachers;

Ability to interact with students;

Ability to interact with parents;

Ability to use effective classroom management techniques;

and Answer to oral responses in an interview.

Survey Responses to Items 43 through 46

Questions 43 through 46 were of a qualitative nature. Not all of the principals responded to each question.

Question 43 asked the principals if there were any criteria or methods that were not listed on the survey that they use in selecting new teachers. The principals were also invited to list the criteria or methods. Nine principals responded to item 43 from the lower SES school districts and 15 principals from the higher SES school districts. Some principals wrote several responses. The responses have been grouped by this researcher and can be found in Table 105. All of the responses, in their entirety appear in Appendix B.

Table 106

Question 43: Are there any criteria or methods you use in selecting new teachers that were not listed in this survey?

	Low SES Schools	High SES Schools
Personal Traits	Ability to prioritize Annoying Habits Match to community values	Appearance Personal life / Life skills Demeanor Flexibility Friendliness Personality Personal strengths Voice tone and quality Warmth and kindness Will children like this teacher?
Educational Background	Early literacy	Computer skills Dual certification Instructional risks No alternate route Portfolio review (2)
Perceived Intelligence	Writing skills	Desire to learn Gut feeling Quiz What are they reading?
Professional Relationships	None listed	None listed
Knowledge of Instructional Methods	None listed	Balanced literacy Demonstration lessons
Hiring Procedures	Second interview Group Interview	Group Interview (4) Lunch with teachers Scenario responses
Other	Local candidate versus transplant Affirmative action	None listed

In Table 105, numbers that appear in parentheses are the number of times that particular method or criteria was

mentioned by a different principal from the same SES school district.

Each response that was written was assigned into one of the following categories by this researcher; *Personal Traits, Educational Background, Perceived Intelligence, Professional Relationships, Knowledge of Instructional Methods,* and *Hiring Procedures.* There were two responses, from principals in the lower SES school districts that were designated as *Other* because they did not fit into one of the six categories.

Questions 44 and 45 were linked to each other. Question forty-four asked the principals if they felt there was currently a shortage of quality teachers. If the principal responded with a yes, he or she was asked to respond to question forty-five, which asked in what ways, if any, have they changed their hiring practices because of the teaching shortage. For question forty-four, 26 of the 28 principals from the lower SES school districts responded and 33 of the 36 principals from the higher SES school districts responded (See Table 106).

Table 107

Item 44: Do principals feel that there is currently a teacher shortage based on the SES of the principal's school district?

	Low SES	High SES
Yes	14	12
No	12	21

Eleven principals responded to item 45 from the lower SES school districts and 15 principals from the higher SES school districts. Some principals wrote several responses. The responses have been grouped by this researcher into the following categories; *Before the Interview, During the Interview,* and *After the Interview* (See Table 107). All of the responses, in their entirety appear in Appendix B.

Table 108

Item 45: Ways that principals have changed their hiring practices based on a perception of a quality teacher shortage

	Low SES Schools	High SES Schools
Before the Interview	Alternate route Attend job fairs (3) Develop relationships with colleges (2) Math and Science majors Minority recruiting Student teachers	Attend job fairs Develop relationships with colleges (3) Hire earlier (2) Increased advertising (2) Reach out to personal and professional contacts Teaching experience
During the Interview	Interview at colleges Look for sparkle, enthusiasm, and passion for children	Committee Demonstration lesson Respond to written prompt
After the Interview	Don't settle (2) Substitute teacher first (2) Take lesser of two evils	Emergency certificates Immediate follow-up with quality candidates

As in Table 105, numbers that appear in parentheses in Table 106 are the number of times that a particular change in hiring practices was mentioned by a different principal from the same SES school district. Principals from both SES school districts had some responses in each of the three categories. Before the interview, responses that were common to both groups of principals consisted of attending job fairs and developing relationships with colleges. During the interview and after the interview contained no responses that were common to both groups of principals.

Item 46 allowed for principals to add any comments concerning the topics of interviewing or selecting new

teachers. Six principals responded to item 46 from the lower SES school districts and 17 principals from the higher SES school districts. Some principals wrote several responses. The responses have been grouped by this researcher into two categories; *The Interview* and *Selecting New Teachers* and can be found in Table 108. All of the responses, in their entirety appear in Appendix B.

Table 109

Item 46: Additional comments concerning interviewing and selecting new teachers

	Low SES Schools	High SES Schools
The Interview	Committee interview (2) Refrain from hiring teachers that misuse language Scripted questions	Attractive, energetic, neat, clean, and well-mannered Committee interview (2) Excellent manager of time, materials, and children How will kids react to them? Personality, charisma, and knowledge of subject matter
Selecting New Teachers	Background checks are important Don't give tenure to average teachers (2) Plenty of elementary school teachers Teach children, not subjects Weaknesses exist in math and science Weaknesses exist in reading/language	Culture match Few exceptional teacher candidates Hire too late Invest time to find best candidate No alternate route candidates Reference checks State colleges not preparing students to teach as well as out of state (2) Weaknesses exist in reading/language Weaknesses exist in special education teacher candidates

Numbers that appear in parentheses in Table 107 are the number of times that particular comment was mentioned by a different principal from the same SES school district. Principals from both SES school districts had some responses in each of the two categories. With regards to interviewing, the only common response to both groups of principals consisted of holding a committee interview.

Weaknesses existing in reading and language was the only common response in the section of selecting new teachers.

Summary

The data from this study indicates that there are several statistically significant differences in what New Jersey elementary school principals are looking for when selecting new teachers based on the socioeconomic status of the district where they work. Based on this study, of the qualities listed by this researcher, principals desire the following qualities in new teachers regardless of the SES of the district where they work:

Passion for teaching;

Positive attitude;

Ability to motivate;

Enthusiasm;

Ability to communicate;

Ability to interact with students;

Ability to interact with parents;

Ability to use effective classroom management techniques;

and Answer to oral responses in an interview.

Along with this list of qualities, principals from lower SES school districts also value the candidate's ability to use varied instructional techniques. Principals

from higher SES school districts desire the list above along with values and the ability to interact with other teachers.

Thirteen personal traits were examined and two yielded statistically significant differences. The data suggests that statistically significant differences exist (t = 2.222) between how principals from lower SES school districts view *Creativity* and the principals from higher SES school districts. The difference is significant at the .030 level based on Levene's Test of Equality. The estimated effect for this trait is medium, which means that it could have some importance. The positive t value would suggest that principals from the lower SES school districts rate a higher importance to creativity than the principals from the higher SES school districts when hiring new teachers. In addition, the data suggests that statistically significant differences exist (t = -2.379) between this same group of principals with respect to *Values*. This difference is significant at the .021 level based on Levene's Test of Equality. The estimated effect for this trait is medium, which means that it could have some importance. The negative t value would suggest that principals from the higher SES school districts rate a

higher importance to values than the principals from the lower SES school districts when hiring new teachers.

Six items were examined under educational background and two statistically significant differences were noted. The data suggests that a statistically significant difference exists (t = -2.039) between lower and higher SES principals with respect to the *Possession of Multiple Certificates*. The difference is significant at the .046 level based on Levene's Test of Equality. The estimated effect for this trait is medium, which means that it could have some importance. The negative t value would suggest that principals from the higher SES school districts placed a greater importance on the possession of multiple certificates (as opposed to one certificate) than the principals from the lower SES school districts. Additionally, the data suggests that a statistically significant difference exists (t = -2.010) between lower SES and higher SES principals with respect to *Teaching Experience*. The difference is significant at the .049 level based on Levene's Test of Equality. The estimated effect for this trait is medium, which means that it could have some importance. The negative t value would suggest that principals from the higher SES school districts placed

a greater importance on teaching experience than the principals from the lower SES school districts.

Four items were examined under perceived intelligence and two items were found to be statistically significant. The data suggests that a statistically significant difference exists ($t = -2.378$) between lower and higher SES principals with respect to the *Overall College Grade Point Average*. The difference is significant at the .021 level based on Levene's Test of Equality. The estimated effect for this trait is medium, which means that it could have some importance. The negative t value would suggest that principals from the higher SES school districts placed a greater importance on overall college grade point average than the principals from the lower SES school districts. Additionally, the data suggests that a statistically significant difference exists ($t = -2.634$) between lower SES and higher SES principals with respect to *Education Course Work Grade Point Average*. The difference is significant at the .011 level based on Levene's Test of Equality. The estimated effect for this trait is large, which means that it probably has importance. The negative t value would suggest that principals from the higher SES school districts placed a greater importance on education

course work grade point average than the principals from the lower SES school districts.

Three items were investigated under professional relationships. This study would suggest that no statistically significant differences exist between lower and higher SES principals in this area.

Seven items were examined under knowledge of instructional methods and one statistically significant difference was noted. The data suggests that a statistically significant difference exists (t = 2.378) between lower and higher SES principals with respect to the *Ability to Celebrate Diversity*. The difference is significant at the .015 level when equal variances are not assumed. The estimated effect for this trait is medium, which means that it could have some importance. The positive t value would suggest that principals from the lower SES school districts placed a greater importance on the ability to celebrate diversity than the principals from the higher SES school districts.

Seven items were examined under hiring procedures and one statistically significant difference was noted. The data suggests that a statistically significant difference exists (t = 2.309) between lower and higher SES principals with respect to the Essay *Responses to a Written Prompt*.

The difference is significant at the .024 level based on Levene's Test of Equality. The estimated effect for this trait is medium, which means that it could have some importance. The positive *t* value would suggest that principals from the lower SES school districts placed a greater importance on the essay responses to a written prompt than the principals from the higher SES school districts.

Two items were examined under self-perceptions regarding hiring and one statistically significant difference was noted. The data suggests that a statistically significant difference exists ($t = -2.955$) between lower and higher SES principals with respect to the how the principals *Rate the Methods They Use When Hiring New Teachers*. The difference is significant at the .004 based on Levene's Test of Equality. The estimated effect for this trait is large, which means that it probably has importance. The negative *t* value would suggest that principals from the higher SES school districts rate methods they use higher than the principals from the lower SES school districts.

Chapter V

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter summarizes the findings as they relate to the research questions, conclusions, recommendations for further study, and recommendations for policy and practice. This study described various teacher-selection criteria used by elementary school principals in New Jersey. The criteria were analyzed based on the socioeconomic status of the districts to identify similarities and differences that may exist between the principals from their respective districts.

This study was conducted in November and December of 2004 and consisted of the survey responses of 120 elementary school principals selected randomly. A total of 62 principals responded to the survey. Of these 62 respondents, 28 were principals from the lower SES school districts and 34 were principals from the higher SES school districts.

The data from this survey provided information on the criteria that principals look for when hiring a new teacher. The criteria was grouped into five categories

consisting of personal traits, educational background, perceived intelligence, professional relationships, and the candidate's knowledge of instructional methods. The survey also examined the hiring practices of the principals and the opinions the principals had of their own hiring practices.

The remainder of this chapter presents answers to the research questions. These answers will be followed by recommendations for further study and recommendations for policy and practice. The research questions are presented in the same format as they were presented in chapter one.

Research Questions

1. Which teacher candidate qualities do New Jersey elementary school principals rate as most important?

To answer this question, the mean responses were analyzed for items 1 through 40. If a question achieved a mean response rate of 4.5 or higher, the characteristic was listed as a quality that New Jersey principals perceive as important. Of the 40 items examined, a total of twelve items scored a mean response of 4.50 or higher. The following nine qualities were rated most important by principals from both high and low socioeconomic school districts:

Passion for teaching;

Positive attitude;

Ability to motivate;

Enthusiasm;

Ability to communicate;

Ability to interact with students;

Ability to interact with parents;

Ability to use effective classroom management;

and Answer to oral responses in an interview

Only the principals from the lower SES school districts rated *the ability to use varied instructional strategies* as important. Only the principals from the higher SES school districts rated *values*, and the *ability to interact with other teachers* as important characteristics. The data suggests that there is strong agreement between the two groups of principals as to the qualities that are important when hiring new teachers. Of the 40 items examined, a total of twelve items were deemed important by at least one group of principals. Of the 12 items, 9 were common to both groups.

In the literature, as described in chapter two, many researcher describe the traits inherent in effective teachers. The twelve traits deemed important by the

principals in this study have also been identified in the research as traits that are important in quality teachers.

McEwan (2002) described 4 traits that are agreed upon by both sets of principals as important. McEwan listed Mission Driven and Passionate (see also Traina, 1999) as a trait that correlates with *Passion for Teaching*. Positive and real was another McEwan trait, which is similar to having a *Positive Attitude*. McEwan's also listed Motivational Expertise, which matches with *Ability to Motivate* and finally, McEwan listed having a Mental Life, which had a subset of Communicative. This is agreed upon by both sets of principals as the *Ability to Communicate*.

Enthusiasm was also found as an important attribute in the literature. Johnson (as cited by Newton & Newton, 2001) surveyed secondary school principals and *Enthusiasm* and *Communication Skills* were the two most important qualities in teacher selection.

Glasgow and Hicks (2003) listed three categories; *Interacting and Collaborating with Students* (see also Borich, 1993), *Managing Classroom Organization and Discipline* (see also Borich 1993), and *Fostering a Positive Relationship with Parents* (see also Marzano, 2003). These three traits were confirmed by both sets of principals as being important.

Only the principals from the lower SES school districts rated the *Ability to Use Varied Instructional Strategies* as important based on the criteria developed for this study. This trait is prevalent in the literature (McEwan, 2002 ; Marzano, 2003; Glasgow & Hicks, 2003). However, nothing in the literature would indicate that this trait would be more desired by principals in lower SES school districts than principals in the higher SES school districts.

Conversely, there were two traits that principals from the higher SES school districts rated as important, yet the principals from the lower SES school districts did not. These two traits are *Values* and the *Ability to Interact with Other Teachers*. Borich (1993) identified values and relationships with others as traits of effective teachers. Glasgow & Hicks, (2003) also identified enhancing professional relationships with colleagues. This study confirms that principals see these traits as important but has identified that the principals from the higher SES school districts rate these two traits more importantly.

2. What relationship exists between the teacher candidate qualities desired by New Jersey elementary school principals in higher socio-economic districts and New

Jersey elementary school principals in lower socio-economic districts?

This question is answered through an analysis of the five subsets of the survey, which comprise section one. These five subsets consist of questions one through 33.

a. How significantly do principals rate the personal traits of teacher candidates based on the socioeconomic status of the school district in which they work?

Thirteen personal traits were investigated in this study. Results were collected and compared from principals from lower SES school districts and principals from higher SES school districts. Independent sample T-tests were performed on the results of these thirteen items. Two statistically significant differences existed between how important principals from the lower SES school districts viewed personal traits and how the principals from the higher SES school districts viewed these same traits.

The first personal trait that the data suggests statistically significant differences exist (t = 2.222) between the principals from the lower and higher SES districts was *Creativity*. This difference was significant at the .030 level based on Levene's Test of Equality and the estimated effect for this trait is medium, which means

that it could have some importance. The data suggests that the principals from the lower SES school districts place a higher importance on creativity in teacher candidates than the principals from the higher SES school districts when selecting new teachers.

McEwan (2002) and Borich (1993) both identified creativity as a trait of effective teachers. This study confirms that principals believe that the personal trait of creativity is important for selecting new teachers. However, this research suggests that principals from the lower SES schools find this to be more important than the principals from the higher SES school districts.

Values was the second personal trait found to have a statistically significant difference between the two groups of principals ($t = -2.379$). This difference was significant at the .021 level based on Levene's Test of Equality and the estimated effect for this trait is medium, which means that it could have some importance. The data suggests that the principals from the higher SES school districts place a greater importance on values than the principals from the lower SES school districts when selecting new teachers.

Borich (1993) also identified that effective teachers know what they value and focus their behaviors on those

values. This study confirms that principals feel this is an important trait for selecting new teachers, however, principals from the higher SES school districts find values to be more important than the principals from the lower SES school districts.

b. How significantly do principals view the educational background of teacher candidates based on the socioeconomic status of the school district in which they work?

This study investigated six characteristics related to the educational background of a teacher candidate. Independent sample t-Tests were performed to examine whether statistically significant differences existed between New Jersey principals from the lower and higher SES school districts. The results of this study suggest there were two statistically significant differences.

The first item, under educational background, that the data suggests that a statistically significant difference exists was the importance of the *Possession of Multiple Certificates* ($t = -2.039$). This difference was significant at the .046 level based on Levene's Test of Equality and the estimated effect for this trait is medium, which means that it could have some importance. The data suggests that principals from the higher SES school districts place a

greater importance on the possession of multiple certificates, when selecting new teachers, than the principals from the lower SES school districts.

Stronge (2002) identified two areas of interest with regard to certification. Strong identified areas that will improve student performance. Two of the areas, students that are taught by teachers that are certified in their field of education have higher achievement and students perform better when taught by teachers who majored or minored in the subject are teaching, indicate that subject specific certification tends to result in higher student achievement. This would appear to indicate that teachers with multiple certificates would be better versed in more areas, which would cause them to be more desired by principals. This study reinforces that teacher candidates with multiple certifications would be more desirable, however, this study found that principals from the higher SES school districts place a greater importance on multiple certifications than the principals from the lower SES school districts.

The other statistically significant difference was whether or not the teacher candidate had any *Teaching Experience* ($t = -2.010$). This difference was significant at the .049 level based on Levene's Test of Equality and

the estimated effect for this trait is medium, which means that it could have some importance. The data suggests that the principals from the higher SES school districts place a greater importance on teacher candidates possessing prior teaching experience than the principals from the lower SES school districts when selecting new teachers.

Stronge also listed teaching experience as an area that affects student performance. He found that experienced teachers better understand their students' learning needs, skills, styles, and interests (Stronge, 2002). This study demonstrated that the principals from the higher SES school districts placed a greater importance on teacher experience than the principals from the lower SES schools.

c. How significantly do principals view the perceived intelligence of teacher candidates based on the socioeconomic status of the school district in which they work?

Four items that measured perceived intelligence were examined for this study. After independent sample t-tests were performed, two statistically significant differences were found between how important principals from lower SES school districts in New Jersey viewed the perceived

intelligence of teacher candidates from the principals in the higher SES school districts.

The first item under perceived intelligence that the data suggests a statically significant difference exists is the *Overall Grade Point Average* ($t = -2.378$). This difference was significant at the .021 level based on Levene's Test of Equality and the estimated effect for this trait is medium, which means that it could have some importance. The data suggests that the principals from the higher SES school districts place a greater importance on the overall grade point average of the teacher candidates than the principals from the lower SES school districts.

The other item under perceived intelligence that demonstrated that statistically significant differences exist was the *Education Course Work Grade Point Average* ($t = -2.634$). This difference was significant at the .011 level based on Levene's Test of Equality and the estimated effect for this trait is large, which means that it probably has importance. The data suggests that the principals from the higher SES school districts place a greater importance on the teacher candidate's educational course work grade point average than the principals from the lower SES school districts.

Stronge (2002) specifically examined verbal ability when he investigated course work. He found that teachers with high verbal ability were better instructors than teachers with low verbal ability. He also found that students of teachers that majored or minored in the subject they are teaching performed better. McEwan (2002) also identified that teachers who have a sound knowledge of content is a trait of an effective teacher. This study concludes that bother overall grade point average and educational grade point average are deemed more important by principals in the higher SES school districts than by the principals of the lower SES school districts.

d. How significantly do principals view the professional relationships of teacher candidates based on the socioeconomic status of the school district in which they work?

This study investigated three types of professional relationships. After the results were collected and independent sample t-tests were performed, the data suggests that no statistically significant differences exist between how principals from the lower SES school districts view professional relationships as compared to the principals from the higher SES school districts.

As discussed with the last research question, there have been several studies on the professional relationships of teachers (Borich, 1993; Glasgow & Hicks, 2003). This study confirms that principals feel this is important when hiring new teachers and concludes that there is no statistical difference between principals from lower and higher SES school districts with regard to the importance they place on area.

e. How significantly do principals view the teacher candidate's knowledge of various instructional methods based on the socioeconomic status of the school district in which they work?

Seven items were examined with regard to the candidate's knowledge of instructional methods and one item produced a statistically significant difference. The data suggests that a statistically significant difference exists between principals from lower and higher SES school districts regarding a candidate's *Ability to Celebrate Diversity* ($t = 2.492$). This item is significant at the .015 level using Levene's Test of Equality but with the equality of the variances not being assumed. The estimated effect for this trait is medium, which means that it could have some importance. The data suggests that principals from the lower SES school districts place a greater

importance on the ability to celebrate diversity than the principals from the higher SES school districts when hiring new teachers.

Glasgow and Hicks (2003) identified celebrating diversity in the classroom as a strategy that teachers can use to be more effective in the classroom. Glasgow and Hicks found that teachers who emphasized the positive in cultural, linguistic, ethnic, and gender identity were more successful. This study found that principals from the lower SES school districts placed a greater importance on celebrating diversity than the principals from the higher SES school districts.

Lower SES school districts are more likely to be in urban areas than the higher SES districts. Urban areas have a more diverse students population and the majority of the students come from minority backgrounds (Snyder, Eng, Evans, & Copeland, 1995). A more diverse student population may explain why the principals from the lower SES school districts placed a greater emphasis on cultural diversity.

All of the principals were given the opportunity to add criteria or methods that they use but were not listed in the survey. As a group, the principals from the higher

SES school districts added more additional criteria than the principals from the lower SES school districts.

For personal traits, the principals from the lower SES school districts listed three additional criteria, the ability of the candidate to prioritize, annoying habits of the candidate, and finding a match to the community values. Each of these criteria was identified only one time, by an individual principal. The principals from the higher SES listed ten criteria, none of which matched the criteria listed by the principals from the lower SES school districts. The principals from the higher SES school districts listed appearance, personal life/life skills, demeanor, flexibility, friendliness, personality, personal strengths, voice tone and quality, warmth and kindness, and if children will like the teacher.

For educational background, a principal from the lower SES school districts listed early literacy as an item under educational background that he or she felt was important. The principals from the higher SES school districts listed five items under educational background that consisted of computer skills, dual certification, instructional risks, desiring no alternate route candidates, and a review of the portfolio. All of these items were listed by only one

principal, except the portfolio review, which was listed by two principals.

For perceived intelligence, a principal from the lower SES school districts listed writing skills as an important criteria used for hiring new teachers. Writing skills was the only additional criteria listed by principals for the lower SES schools. The principals from the higher SES school districts listed four criteria they examined when measuring the perceived intelligence of prospective teachers. The four criteria were the desire to learn, gut feeling about the candidate, giving the candidate a quiz, and asking the candidate about what they are reading. Each of these criteria were listed by only one principal from the higher SES school districts.

No additional criteria or methods were listed by any principal from either the lower or higher SES school districts with regard to professional relationships.

Finally, when examining the candidate's knowledge of instructional methods, the principals from the lower SES school districts did not list additional criteria from the items on the survey. Principals from the higher SES school districts listed two additional criteria to examine a candidate's knowledge of instructional methods; knowledge

about balanced literacy and having the candidate perform a demonstration lesson.

In summary, this research question asked what relationships exists between the teacher candidate qualities desired by New Jersey elementary school principals in higher socio-economic districts and New Jersey elementary school principals in lower socio-economic districts? The data from this study suggests that there are seven statistically significant differences between principals from the lower and higher SES school district with regards to desirable teacher qualities. This data suggests that principals from the lower SES school districts place a greater importance on *Creativity* and the *Ability to Celebrate Diversity* than the principals from the higher SES school district. This same data suggests that principals from the higher SES school districts place a greater importance on *Values*, the *Possession of Multiple Certificates*, *Teaching Experience*, the *Overall Grade Point Average*, and the *Educational Course Work Grade Point Average*.

3. What relationship exists between the hiring practices of New Jersey elementary school principals in higher socio-economic districts and New Jersey elementary school principals in lower socio-economic districts?

This study examined seven different items that pertained to the hiring practices of elementary school principals in New Jersey. Results were collected and independent sample t-tests were conducted to compare the hiring practices of principals from lower SES school districts with principals from higher SES school districts. Of the seven hiring practices examined, only *Essay Responses to a Written Prompt* yielded a statistically significant difference (t = 2.309). This difference was significant at the .024 level using Levene's Test of Equality and the estimated effect for this trait is medium, which means that it could have some importance. The data suggests that principals from the lower SES school districts place a greater importance on the candidate's response to a written prompt than the principals from the higher SES school districts when hiring new teachers.

Johnson (as cited by Newton & Newton, 2001) identified communication as one of the five clusters most important for teacher selection. In Johnson's study, secondary principals rated various activities and interpersonal and oral communication, and enthusiasm, were rated the 3 most important for teacher selection. Stronge (2002), as stated earlier, investigated the benefits of teachers with high verbal ability. This study examined written communication

and concluded that principals in the lower SES school districts rate written responses to an essay more importantly than the principals from the higher SES school districts.

All of the principals in this study were given the opportunity to list any hiring procedures they use that were not listed in this study. The principals in the lower SES school districts listed two procedures; to hold second interviews and to conduct group interviews. Each of these two items was suggested by only one principal. The principals from the higher SES school districts listed three additional hiring procedures; the teacher candidate has lunch with the teachers and to have the candidate respond to various scenarios were each provided by one principal. A third suggestion from the principals from the higher SES school districts was to conduct group interviews. This suggestion was made by four of the principals.

In addition to the data collected regarding hiring practices, two additional questions were asked regarding changes principals have made in their hiring practices relevant to the perceived teacher shortage. When asked about their perceptions of a teacher shortage, fourteen principals from the lower SES school districts felt there

was a teacher shortage while twelve did not. This data would suggest that the principals from the lower SES school districts are split in their opinions of the existence of a teacher shortage.

In the higher SES school districts, twelve principals felt there was a teacher shortage and twenty-one principals felt there was not a teacher shortage. This data would suggest that a majority of principals from higher SES school districts are not experiencing problems finding candidates to apply for their teacher openings. This data would also suggest that principals from the higher SES school districts are having less difficulty finding teacher candidates than the principals from the lower SES school districts.

Principals were given the opportunity to offer changes they have made to their hiring practices based on a perception of a quality teacher shortage. Their responses were divided into three categories; changes they made before the interview, during the interview, and after the interview. The responses from both groups of principals were evenly divided.

Before the interview, principals from both the lower and higher SES school districts suggested six changes that have been made because of a perceived teacher shortage.

Attending job fairs and developing relationships with colleges was common to both groups of principals. The principals from the lower SES school districts also offered looking at alternate route candidates, looking for math and science majors, recruiting minority candidates, and looking closely at student teachers. The principals from the higher SES school districts stated that they have begun hiring earlier, increased advertising, reaching out to personal and professional contacts, and looking for teaching experience.

During the interview, principals from the lower SES school districts suggested two changes and the principals from the higher SES school districts suggested three changes. The principals from the lower SES school districts suggested interview at the colleges and look for sparkle, enthusiasm, and a passion for children. The principals from the higher SES school districts suggested interview by committee, have the candidate perform a demonstration lesson, and have the candidate respond to a written prompt.

After the interview, the principals from the lower SES school districts suggested that they do not settle, hire new teachers as substitute teachers first, and take the lesser of two evils. The principals from the higher SES

school districts suggested that they request emergency certificates and follow up immediately with quality candidates.

This data would suggest that principals from both the higher and lower SES school districts have made several changes in their hiring procedures. However, although the changes made may be different in each group, the number of changes is relatively consistent throughout the two groups of principals.

4. What opinion do principals have of their own hiring practices based on the socioeconomic status of the school district in which they work?

Two items addressed the self-perceptions the principals in this study had of their own hiring practices. Independent sample t-tests were performed to examine whether statistically significant differences existed between principals from lower SES school districts and those from higher SES school districts. The data from this study suggests that there is one statistically significant difference when the principals *Rate the Methods They Use When Hiring New Teachers* ($t = -2.955$). This difference was significant at the .004 level using Levene's Test of Equality and the estimated effect for this trait is large, which means that it probably has importance. This data

would suggest that principals from the higher SES school districts rate the methods they use for hiring new teachers higher than the principals from the lower SES school districts.

Examining the mean scores to questions 41 and 42, it can be seen that all principals generally rate their hiring practices and methods as high. Klinex and colleagues (1999) found that interviewers believe that they have special powers that enable them to read people. The danger is that interviewers will often ignore parts of the interview and rely on these perceived powers to make decisions. Herman (1994) also found that many interviewers are overconfident in their ability to select employees. This study found that both groups of principals had very high opinions of their methods and practices; however, principals from the higher SES school districts rated their selection methods statistically higher than the principals from the lower SES school districts.

Conclusions

From the results of this study, it can be concluded that although many of the same qualities are desired in selecting new teachers based on the socioeconomic status of the school district, several significant differences exist in the desired teacher criteria of New Jersey principals

based on the socioeconomic status of their school district. More specifically, differences arose with respect to various components of desired personal traits, educational background, perceived intelligence, and the candidate's knowledge of instructional methods. This data also suggests that no significant differences existed between principals from lower and higher SES school districts with respect to the professional relationships they expect the prospective teachers to keep once they are hired. None of the three sub-categories evaluated under professional relationships provided any significant differences. The first null hypothesis is rejected.

Differences existed in one hiring procedure used by the two groups of principals. Although six of the seven items examined under hiring practices provided no significant differences, a significant response was revealed for how teacher candidates respond to a written prompt. The second null hypothesis is rejected.

Finally, this research suggests that there is a significant difference in principals' perceptions of the effectiveness of their hiring practices based upon the SES of the school district in which they work. Principals from the higher SES school districts rate the methods they use when hiring new teachers significantly higher than their

counterparts from the lower SES school districts. The third null hypothesis is rejected.

Recommendations for Further Study

It has been said that every answer leads to more questions (unknown). The data from this study suggests some conclusions and answers, but there are a number of new questions that develop based on this study. This section will list some potential areas for further study.

1. Only 11 of the 40 items had a mean response of less than 3.5, so the researcher used 4.5 as a boundary for most important qualities. Since it is unlikely that interviewers are actually assessing all of the criteria and qualities that they find desirable, it may be beneficial to test the hypothesis of desirable qualities through a method other than a survey. By observing interviewers in action or recording the interview, valuable information could be acquired by noting each time one of the 40 qualities or hiring practices was assessed. That data could be compared with the data from this study.
2. Similarities existed when principals designated various teacher candidate criteria as desirable and important. The principals from the lower SES school districts rated the ability to use varied

instructional strategies as more important than the principals from the higher SES school districts. Principals from the higher SES school districts rated values and the ability to interact with other teachers as more important than the principals from the lower SES school districts. It would be of interest to investigate the reasons for these preferences. These three criteria could be investigated using a qualitative approach to interview principals to see if a reason could be discovered as to why this difference exists.

3. The data suggested that principals from lower SES school districts desired the teacher qualities of creativity and the ability to celebrate diversity more than the principals from the high SES school districts. Principals from the high SES school districts desired values, the possession of multiple certificates, possessing teaching experience, overall grade point average, and educational course work grade point average were more than the principals from the lower SES school districts. Of interest would be an assessment of the candidates' perceptions of their own strengths. By interviewing or assessing a candidate's self perception of his or her strongest qualities, a

study could be conducted to examine if the candidate took a position in a district that matched their own perceptions.

4. This study did not investigate how successful the principals were in hiring teachers for their district. A study could be conducted to measure how long the hired candidate's stay in the district. Teacher's who leave the district should be given exit interviews to determine the reason for leaving and this information could be compared with the original interview notes to see how strong a match between the teacher and the school was predicted prior to being hired.

5. This study was limited to elementary schools. The various hiring practices and desired teacher qualities are only associated with elementary school principals and teacher candidates. It would be interesting to replicate this study with different grade levels to examine if the results are the same for middle school and high school.

6. This study was confined to New Jersey schools. It would be interesting to replicate this study with different states and different regions to see if the same results are replicated.

7. Principals from both the higher and lower SES school districts added additional criteria and practices that did not exist in this survey. Those criteria and methods might be assessed through future revisions of this survey instrument.
8. Principals from the higher SES school districts had more additional criteria and practices that they use in addition to the items in the survey than the principals from the lower SES school district. Questions arise as to how many criteria can be effectively examined prior to selecting a successful candidate.
9. This study revealed that no significant differences existed between the two groups of principals with respect to professional relationships. However, principals in the higher SES school districts rated the ability to interact with other teachers as very desirable (with a mean response of 4.69) while principals from the lower SES school districts rated it somewhat less importantly (mean response rate of 4.39). Further investigation of this topic is necessary.
10. Seven hiring practices were investigated and the only significant difference was that principals from the

lower SES school districts rated the essay responses to a written prompt more importantly than their counterparts in the higher SES school districts. Further investigation is warranted to discover if the responses were more important or if this hiring practice is simply more prevalent in the lower SES school districts.

11. Principals from the higher SES school districts were less likely to report experiencing a teacher shortage. It would be interesting to measure the number of job applications that are received per job opening based on the socioeconomic status of the school district. Then an assessment of the quality of the teacher candidates should be conducted to examine if these different perceptions of a shortage are based on the percentage of quality applications received.
12. The results of this study indicate that principals in the higher SES school districts have a more positive opinion of the methods they use when hiring new teachers. Further study is warranted to track how successful the two groups of principals are in hiring new teachers.
13. This study only examined the school districts in New Jersey that had a low SES or a high SES. Absent from

this study were school districts that had a moderate SES. Including these school districts would allow the data to be analyzed using an ANOVA. It would be of interest to examine if the inclusion of this group and a different statistical treatment would yield different results.

Recommendations for Policy and Practice

Conclusions from this study lead to recommendations to shape policy and practice in education. Recommendations are made to individuals, such as principals and teachers, school districts, state, and federal policymakers.

1. The Federal No Child Left Behind legislation has dramatically raised the accountability for schools. This legislation is "designed to change the culture of America's schools by closing the achievement gap, offering more flexibility, giving parents more options, and teaching students based on what works" (U.S. Department of Education, 2005). This research has shown that principals in school districts with different SES levels have varied their hiring techniques to select teachers that, at least in their perception, are good matches to their schools. Educational leaders must hire candidates who meet the criteria for "highly qualified teachers" as defined in

the NCLB Act. Educational leaders would be wise to not lose selection criteria based on what is best for the school. Districts should incorporate NCLB standards into hiring policy while maintaining the selection criteria they feel most benefits their school.

2. As part of No Child Left Behind legislation, states are able to design their own assessment program. New Jersey uses a commercially developed standardized test known as the NJASK to assess knowledge of the literacy, mathematics, and science skills of students in grades three and four (ETS, 2005). As stated in policy recommendation number one above, principals should careful in not forsaking quality teachers, who match or improve the climate of the schools, for teachers who are more versed in a particular subject area but lack effective teaching skills.

3. Advise educational leaders in school districts to work closely with universities, colleges, and other teacher preparation programs to assist them in designing their programs around the needs of their districts. This relationship may assist the colleges to better place their students into teaching positions and would help

the school districts by increasing the pool of desirable teachers.

4. District and state educational leaders would be advised to train principals in interviewing. Little or no training of principals currently occurs and training would assist in moving the goals of the district forward. The results of this study could be used as a springboard for principals to first, examine how their hiring practices align with principals from similar districts, and also to see if their interviewing can improve by eliminating any biases that exist due to the SES of their school district.
5. Principals are encouraged to continually monitor and evaluate their hiring practices and the desired qualities in teaching candidates. By evaluating their hiring practices, principals can ensure that the candidates they hire match the district goals, vision, and philosophy. Self-evaluation also allows the principal to recognize hiring biases that he or she may have. Once these biases are recognized, principals can evaluate whether the biases are positive or negative.
6. Districts would be wise to assess how their principals retain the teachers they hire. Knowing what

percentage of the newly hired teachers remain after one year and five years can be very valuable in evaluating the hiring practices of principals. If a higher than expected percentage of teachers do not remain, assessing the hiring biases of the principals would prove beneficial.

7. School districts need to develop policy on interviewing new teachers. Since this study has demonstrated that school districts with different socioeconomic status have different hiring practices and desired teacher qualities, districts would want to develop policy to hire teachers that match the needs of the district. Policies should be developed regarding the hiring of principals so that their hiring practices and biases match the district.
8. Districts should develop sample questions and mandatory questions to seek candidates who are a fit to the needs of the district. There may be several sets of different questions developed so that different schools with individual needs are accounted for.
9. Districts will need to incorporate interviewing into their budget. Training of principals, monitoring the success rate of selected teacher candidates,

developing district goals, and standardizing the interview process will cost money. Districts would be wise to plan accordingly and to establish interviewing and hiring in the budget process.

References

Abrami, P. C. (2001). *Statistical analysis for the social sciences: An interactive approach*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Allen, M. (Summer 2002). Improving teacher preparation, recruitment, and retention. *Spectrum: The Journal of State Government*, 75(3), 8.

Ayers, W. (1993). *To teach: The journey of a teacher*. New York : Teachers College Press.

Beatty, R. H. (1994). *Interviewing and selecting high performers: Every manager's guide to effective interviewing techniques*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc..

Bell, A. H. (1989). *The complete managers guide to interviewing*. Homewood, Illinois: Doe Jones-Irwin .

Borich , G. D. (1993). *Clearly outstanding: Making each day count in your classroom*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Cardinal, P. (2003). *Questions you should ask when hiring: Choosing the best candidates for your staff depends a lot on selecting the right interview questions*. Family Practice Management, 10(6), 46.

Cayne, B. S. (1989). *The New Lexicon Webster's dictionary* . New York: Lexicon Publications, Inc.

Cuban, L. (1984). Transforming the frog into a prince: Effective schools research, policy, and practice at the district level. *Harvard Educational Review*, 54(2), 129-151.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). *Solving the dilemmas of teacher supply, demand, and standards: How we can ensure a competent, caring, and qualified teacher for every child.* NY: National Commission on Teaching & America's Future.

Eder, R. W., Kacmar, K. M., & Ferris, G. R. (1989). Employment interview research: History and synthesis . In R.W. Eder & G.R. Ferris (Eds.), *The employment interview: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 17-31). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

ETS. (2005, January 27). *New Jersey department of education assessment of skills and knowledge*. Retrieved February 13, 2005, from http://www.ets.org/njask/

Fink, A. (1995). *How to ask survey questions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Gagnon, Jr., W. L. (2003). *Complete interview procedures for hiring school personnel*. Lanham, Maryland: The Scarecrow Press, Inc..

Glasgow, N. A., & Hicks, C. D. (2003). *What successful teachers do: 91 research-based classroom strategies for new and veteran teachers*. Thousand Oaks, CA : Corwin Press, Inc.

Glickman, C. (1990). *Supervision of instruction: A developmental approach*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Goddard, R. D., Sweetland, S. R., & Hoy, W. K. (2000). Academic emphasis of urban elementary schools and student achievement in reading and mathematics: A multilevel analysis. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 36(5), 683-702. Retrieved July 24, 2004, from http://www.coe.ohio-state.edu/whoy/gsh.pdf

Half, R. (1993). *Finding, hiring, and keeping the best employees (ed.)*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Herman , S. J. (1994). *Hiring right: a practical guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc..

Houghton Mifflin Co. (2004). elementary school. In *The American heritage dictionary if the English language* (4th ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Ingersoll, R. (1994). Teacher shortages and teacher quality. Paper presented at the meeting of the Annual Meeting of the American Statistical Association. Athens, GA.

Ingersoll, R. M., & Smith, T. M. (2003). The wrong solution to the teacher shortage. *Educational Leadership*, 60(8), 30-33.

International Index and Dictionary of Rehabilitation and Social Integration. (n.d.). *Definition of term: educational background*. Retrieved February 6, 2005, from http://www.med.univ-rennes1.fr/iidris/cache/an/10/1078

Jensen, M. C. (1987). *How to recruit, select, induct, and retain the very best teachers* (ED279056). Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management.

Kisner, M. J. (1998). Asking the right questions: Interview tips to find the vocational teachers of the future (Tip Sheet #9). Boalsburg, PA: Custom Instructional Communications Group.

Klinvex, K. C., O'Connell, M. S., & Klinvex, C. P. (1999). *Hiring great people*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lambert, L. (2003). *Leadership capacity for lasting school improvement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Longo, G. (2003). Applying credibility to teacher hiring. *School Administrator*, 60(5), 35.

Marzano, R. (2003). *What works in schools: Translating research into action*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Mazurek, K., Winzer, M. A., & Majorek, C. (2000). *Education in a global society: A comparative perspective*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

McEwan, E. K. (2002). *Ten traits of highly effective teachers: How to hire, coach, and mentor successful teachers* . Thousand Oaks, CA : Corwin Press, Inc. .

Mercer, M. W. (1993). *Hire the best...and avoid the rest*. New York: American Management Association .

National Center for Educational Statistics (2002). CCD Quick facts. Retrieved August 9, 2003, from Web Site: http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/quickfacts.html

National Commission on Teaching & America's Future (1996, September). *What matters most: Teaching for America's future*. NY: National Commission on Teaching & America's Future.

National Education Association (2003). *Meeting the challenges of recruitment and retention*. Washington: National Education Association.

New Jersey Department of Education (n.d.). District factoring grouping system. Retrieved July 7, 2003, from http://www.state.nj.us/njded/finance/sf/dfgdesc.shtml

New Jersey Department of Education (n.d.). NJ Department of Education District Factor Groups (DFG) for School Districts. Retrieved August 9, 2003, from http://www.state.nj.us/njded/finance/sf/dfg90.shtml

Newton, D., & Newton, L. (2001). Choosing and judging teachers: What heads and student teachers think matters. *Research in Education*, 66, 54-64.

NextStep.org. (n.d.). A full featured, career development, & job finding resource for youth. Retrieved July 27, 2004, from http://www.nextsteps.org/

Protheroe, N., Lewis, A., & Paik, S. (Winter 2002). Promoting quality teaching. ERS Spectrum. Retrieved July 1, 2003, from Educational Research Service Web Site: http://www.ers.org/spectrum/win02a.htm

Rea, L., & Parker, R. A. (1997). *Designing and conducting survey research* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Sergiovanni, T. (1996). *Leadership for the schoolhouse: How is it different? Why is it important?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc..

Snyder, J. F., Eng, K. M., Evans, D., & Copeland, H. H. (1995 November). *Teacher supply and demand, a 1995 MAASCUS research report* (ED390866). Madison, Wis.: Association for School, College, and University Staffing.

Stevens, C. (2001). Formulating new criteria for teacher candidate selection. *Education*, 122(2), 365-371.

Stronge, J. (2002). *Qualities of effective teachers*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Traina, R. P. (1999, January 20). What makes a good teacher? [Electronic version]. *Education Week*, 18, 34. Retrieved July 17, 2004, from http://educationweek.org/ew/vol-18/19traina.h18

U.S. Department of Education. (n.d.). *Stronger accountability: Accountability for all schools*. Retrieved February 13, 2005, from http://www.ed.gov/nclb/accountability/index.html

Westbrook, A. (January 22-25, 1998). Teacher selection practices in effective elementary schools which differ in community type and socioeconomic status context. Paper presented at the meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association. Houston, TX.

Witte, R. S., & Witte, J. S. (2001). *Statistics* (6th ed.). New York: Harcourt College Publishers.

WordNet. (2001). *Definition of elementary school*. Retrieved February 5, 02, from http://www.answers.com/topic/primary-education

Appendix A

Letter of Solicitation and Survey

Dear Principal:

I am a doctoral student in the Educational Administration Department, at the College of Education and Human Services, Seton Hall University.

I am currently conducting research on how different school districts in New Jersey interview prospective teachers. My research will analyze how districts with a District Factor Grouping (DFG) of A, B, C, or D interview candidates with districts G, H, I, or J. When I have collected all of the data I will compare and contrast the data between the two categories of districts. Your participation in my research should constitute no more than fifteen minutes of your time.

I respectfully request that you complete the enclosed three-section checklist and the three open-ended questions, which examine criteria and procedures you use for hiring new teachers. Then please use the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope to mail the completed survey back to me within ten days. At that point, your participation will be complete and you will have contributed to the base of knowledge concerning teacher selection and hiring.

The survey you will be completing is the "New Jersey Principal's Perceptions of What Candidate Criteria and Hiring Procedures Are Most Valuable for Selecting New Teachers". You are one of 120 principals in New Jersey who are being requested to complete this survey, and the only principal in your school district.

Your completion of the survey is completely voluntary and by doing so you indicate your informed consent and your willingness to participate. If you choose not to participate or withdraw your participation at any time, you will suffer no hardship.

No information will be stored which identifies any participants in this study. The coding on the surveys is only used for identifying the DFG of the responses and for mailing purposes. The coding index will be destroyed two weeks after the last survey is received. Confidentiality and anonymity will be preserved.

All of the collected surveys will be kept in a locked office cabinet for three years and then they will be shredded. All of the collected data will be stored based on the DFG of the district of which the principal completed the survey and will not identify the participant.

No person, other than myself, will have access to returned surveys. The data collected from returned surveys will be presented as an aggregate of information in the final dissertation and no identifying information will be included.

There are no anticipated risks to completing this survey.

Although there is no compensation for completing this survey, there are benefits. By completing this survey, you will be contributing to the knowledge base of hiring practices and of principals in New Jersey. As a participant, you will also have an opportunity to access the aggregate data and the final dissertation project.

If you have any questions related to this study, please contact this researcher at the College of Education and Human Services, Seton Hall University, Kozlowski Hall, 4th Floor, South Orange, New Jersey 07079 or by telephone at 973-761-9395.

This project has been reviewed and approved by the Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects Research. The IRB believes that the research procedures adequately safeguard the subject's privacy, welfare, civil liberties, and rights. The Chairperson of the IRB may be reached at (973) 275-2977 or 313- 6314.

Consent to participate is indicated by returning the enclosed survey to the researcher.

Thank you very much for your participation in this study. A copy of this research will be available as an open dissertation on the Seton Hall Library website when completed. The anticipated completion date is Spring, 2005.

Sincerely,

Edward J. Forsthoffer, III
Doctoral Candidate, Seton Hall University

New Jersey Principals' Perceptions of What Candidate Criteria and Hiring Procedures Are Most Valuable for Selecting New Teachers

Directions for Section One: Please indicate the degree of importance each criteria has on your hiring decisions when you are interviewing teacher candidates for positions in your building. The following scale should be used for your responses.

1 = Not important
2 = Somewhat important
3 = Important
4 = Very important
5 = Extremely important
6 = Unable to determine during an interview

(Note: It is assumed that none of the qualities listed below can be fully determined during an interview. Only indicate #6 if a procedure other than the interview is used to determine if a candidate possesses that quality.)

	Personal Traits						
1	Passion For Teaching	1	2	3	4	5	6
2	Positive Attitude	1	2	3	4	5	6
3	Leadership Skills	1	2	3	4	5	6
4	Awareness of the Classroom Surroundings	1	2	3	4	5	6
5	Creativity	1	2	3	4	5	6
6	Humor	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	Charisma	1	2	3	4	5	6
8	Ability to Motivate	1	2	3	4	5	6
9	Values	1	2	3	4	5	6
10	Appearance	1	2	3	4	5	6
11	Enthusiasm	1	2	3	4	5	6
12	Organization	1	2	3	4	5	6
13	Ability to Communicate	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Educational Background						
14	Possessing a Standard (Not an Alternate) Certificate	1	2	3	4	5	6
15	Multiple Certifications as Opposed to One Certification	1	2	3	4	5	6
16	Teaching Experience	1	2	3	4	5	6
17	Ability to Work With Special Needs Children	1	2	3	4	5	6
18	Former Observations (if applicable and available)	1	2	3	4	5	6
19	Cooperating Teacher's Evaluation (Student Teaching)	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Perceived Intelligence						
20	Overall College Grade Point Average	1	2	3	4	5	6
21	Education Course Work Grade Point Average	1	2	3	4	5	6
22	Knowledge of Elementary School Curriculum	1	2	3	4	5	6
23	Stated Educational Philosophy	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Professional Relationships						
24	Ability to Interact with other Teachers	1	2	3	4	5	6
25	Ability to Interact with Students	1	2	3	4	5	6
26	Ability to Interact with Parents	1	2	3	4	5	6

Section One (continued)
1 = Not important
2 = Somewhat important
3 = Important
4 = Very important
5 = Extremely important
6 = Unable to determine during an interview
(Note: It is assumed that none of the qualities listed below can be fully determined during an interview. Only indicate #6 if a procedure other than the interview is used to determine if a candidate possesses that criteria.)

	Knowledge of Instructional Methods						
27	Ability to Use Varied Instructional Strategies	1	2	3	4	5	6
28	Ability to Use Effective Classroom Management Techniques	1	2	3	4	5	6
29	Ability to Pace a Lesson	1	2	3	4	5	6
30	Ability to Write Effective Lesson Plans	1	2	3	4	5	6
31	Ability to Use Assessment to Guide Instruction	1	2	3	4	5	6
32	Ability to Celebrate Diversity	1	2	3	4	5	6
33	Ability to Integrate Technology Into the Classroom	1	2	3	4	5	6

Directions for Section Two: Please indicate the degree of importance each procedure has on your hiring decisions when you are selecting teacher candidates for positions in your building. The following scale should be used for your responses.
1 = Not important
2 = Somewhat important
3 = Important
4 = Very important
5 = Extremely important

6 = This procedure is not used

	Hiring Procedures						
34	Checking Professional References	1	2	3	4	5	6
35	Checking Personal References	1	2	3	4	5	6
36	Answers to Oral Responses in a Interview	1	2	3	4	5	6
37	Essay Responses to a Written Prompt	1	2	3	4	5	6
38	Candidate Conducts a Demonstration Lesson	1	2	3	4	5	6
39	Screening of the Resume for a Match to the Position	1	2	3	4	5	6
40	Information Contained in the Cover Letter	1	2	3	4	5	6

Please Continue to Page 3

Directions for Section Three: Please indicate the effectiveness you believe that criteria (from section one) and the procedures (from section two) are effective indicators for selecting staff in your building.

1 = Not effective
2 = Somewhat effective
3 = Effective
4 = Very effective
5 = Extremely effective

	Self-Perceptions Regarding Hiring					
41	Rate the Methods You Use for Hiring New Teachers	1	2	3	4	5
42	Rate Your Effectiveness in Hiring Quality Teachers	1	2	3	4	5

Directions for Section Four: Please answer the following questions. If more space is needed, please attach a separate piece of paper.

43. Are there any criteria or methods you use in selecting new teachers that were not listed on this survey? Is so, please list them.

44. Do you feel there is currently a shortage of quality teacher candidates? (yes / no)

45. If you feel there is a teacher shortage, in what ways, if any, have you changed your hiring practices?

46. Is there anything you would like to add concerning the topic of interviewing and selecting new teachers in the elementary school

Thank you for participating in this survey.
Please return this survey in the postage paid envelope by November 29, 2004.

Appendix B

Qualitative Responses

Item 43 Qualitative Responses

Lower SES	Higher SES
Personal Traits 1. Present candidate with an in-box activity to see how they prioritize 2. Any obviously annoying habits that could adversely affect teaching (ex. Keeps clearing throat, fast/constant eye blinking) 3. Match to the community and the values that are important to the community	Personal Traits 1. Looking for warmth kindness, and a nurturing spirit 2. Flexibility 3. Personality 4. Friendliness 5. Demeanor 6. Tone of voice and voice quality 7. Will children like this teacher? 8. What do you do in your personal life that enhances your classroom instruction 9. Appearance - check nails and shoes 10. Personal strengths 11. Life skills
Educational Background 1. Early literacy is an essential component in the background experience or training	Educational Background 1. Portfolio review 2. Dual certification in elementary education and special education 3. No alternate route candidates! 4. Willingness to take instructional risks 5. Portfolios 6. Having a candidate respond to a scenario or prompt allows then to demonstrate basic computer skills
Perceived Intelligence 1. Check writing skills by having candidate write an essay on a pertinent teaching topic	Perceived Intelligence 1. I always have candidates complete a brief (8-10) question general knowledge "quiz" while waiting for the interview 2. Desire to learn 3. Do they read - what book are they reading ? 4. "Gut" feeling of person's ability to grow
Professional Relationships	Professional Relationships

Item 43 Qualitative Responses (continued)

Lower SES	Higher SES
Knowledge of Instructional Methods	Knowledge of Instructional Methods 1. Specific knowledge of teaching reading through balanced literacy 2. Use of demonstration lessons
Hiring Procedures 1. Have a second interview and get a second opinion 2. Involve peers and other teachers as much as possible	Hiring Procedures 1. Almost always conduct group interviews with members of the staff participating in the process 2. Interview committee consisting of faculty, staff, parents, BOE member versus interview with single administrator 3. I like to use some situations where the candidate must respond with what he or she would do 4. The superintendent and curriculum supervisor participate in all interviews for teaching candidates 5. We use a team interview approach - all four elementary principals interview all candidates so we can share various perspectives 6. Invite candidates to have lunch with grade level team
Other 1. Local v. transplant 2. We have an affirmative action officer at each interview to ensure that the procedures are fair and non-discriminatory	Other

Item 45 Qualitative Responses

Lower SES	Higher SES
Before the Interview 1. Actively use students teachers 2. Look for Math/Science Majors 3. Personal contacts at college 4. Attend as many job fairs as feasible 5. Improve relations with Colleges and universities 6. Working with CCC minority recruiting 7. We look closely at alternate route candidates. We are an Abbott district with low socioeconomics and it is sometimes difficult to find candidates willing to meet the challenge 8. We go out regular in attempts to recruit candidates 9. Last year, we had our own job fair in district	Before the Interview 1. I have begun to look more at hiring teachers as early as possible to have access to a better pool of candidates 2. The quality of the pool has declined. We now look to hire teachers with some experience over those fresh out of college 3. Increased advertisement 4. Stared earlier in the year observing and connecting with local colleges 5. We have reached out to more personal and professional contacts 6. I have developed a relationship with area colleges to place student teachers in my building 7. Interview while school is in session 8. More recruiting (newspaper ads, job fairs)
During the Interview 1. Interview at colleges 2. Seek candidates with sparkle, enthusiasm, passion for children	During the Interview 1. Allow time for a demonstration lesson 2. Respond to a prompt on the computer 3. Use a small, high-quality committee
After the Interview 1. You sometimes have to take the lesser of two evils 2. We try not to settle of a candidate, but instead keep on advertising and interviewing 3. Hire a candidate as a substitute until she completes her required coursework 4. I have hired a substitute teacher as a foreign language teacher pending Praxis results 5. One must hire the best teacher available at the time	After the Interview 1. We apply for emergency certificates for specialized areas 2. Follow-up immediately with quality candidates

Item 46 Qualitative Responses

Lower SES	Higher SES
The Interview 1. I use a committee of staff (around 4) that includes a mentor teacher 2. Use scripted questions so they are the same for every candidate 3. Interview with a team and have each member rate each question (1-10) 4. New teachers do not have strong backgrounds in language skills and proper grammar. I become annoyed at the misuse of words; subject/verb agreement; etc. in oral and written form.	The Interview 1. Personality, charisma, and knowledge of the subject matter are key 2. Use a committee of teachers consisting of teachers of the grade level/position being filled 3. Candidates must be attractive, energetic, neat clean, and well-mannered. 4. I always use an interview committee with administration plus representative from the grade level where the opening is. Teacher judgment has been extremely accurate 5. Candidate must be an excellent manager of time and materials; not to mention children 6. How will kids react to them 7. Use a committee approach when hiring that is composed of teachers from that grade level/area, guidance counselor, other special area teachers and myself.

Item 46 Qualitative Responses (continued)

Lower SES	Higher SES
Selecting New Teachers 1. Candidates are very weak concerning math and science content 2. Will not tenure an "average" teacher - must be great 3. Knowledge of teaching reading/language skills is minimal 4. Have the courage to let go of mediocre teachers 5. New teachers need to understand that they are teaching children, not subjects 6. Elementary school teachers are plentiful 7. Background checks are very important	Selecting New Teachers 1. Last year I received over 700 resumes for 2 openings! 2. Investing significant time to find the best candidate will prevent further angst at a later time 3. Careful reference checks 4. We have not met with success when dealing with alternate route teachers who have not completed student teaching 5. State colleges are not doing a good job in teacher preparation, especially in the knowledge of teaching reading 6. Finding successful candidates from Penn State and University of Maryland where student teaching is a year long assignment 7. Being a good fit to the culture of the school/district is critical 8. We often do not get permission from the district to hire until just before the start of school when the pool has been "picked over" 9. Not finding quality in the field or reading and writing 8. Colleges are not doing a good job at providing quality instruction on how to teach reading, writing, or standards-based math 9. Difficult to find quality special education teachers, especially in self-contained 10. Difficult time finding exceptional educators

Appendix C

Reliability Alphas

Reliability

** Method 2 (covariance matrix) will be used for this analysis **

R E L I A B I L I T Y A N A L Y S I S - S C A L E (A L P H A)

Correlation Matrix

	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5
Q1	1.0000				
Q2	.7391	1.0000			
Q3	.2188	.2671	1.0000		
Q4	.3234	.3748	.2365	1.0000	
Q5	.2279	.3139	.2160	.2849	1.0000
Q6	.3367	.4337	.3017	.1184	.4489
Q7	.2730	.3930	.3350	.1993	.0789
Q8	.5211	.6054	.3506	.4414	.2539
Q9	.5398	.5236	.3479	.3647	.1217
Q10	.3156	.3550	.4224	.2678	.3335
Q11	.5173	.7384	.1989	.3227	.2947
Q12	.3223	.4647	.4889	.3189	.2335
Q13	.5280	.6163	.3252	.4781	.3880

	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10
Q6	1.0000				
Q7	.3999	1.0000			
Q8	.3327	.4916	1.0000		
Q9	.3862	.4289	.5268	1.0000	
Q10	.5045	.3994	.3497	.2583	1.0000
Q11	.6036	.4812	.6327	.5782	.2971
Q12	.3860	.4782	.5503	.5771	.4495
Q13	.4079	.3878	.6899	.4773	.3390

	Q11	Q12	Q13
Q11	1.0000		
Q12	.4632	1.0000	
Q13	.6546	.5008	1.0000

N of Cases = 62.0

R E L I A B I L I T Y A N A L Y S I S - S C A L E (A L P H A)

Reliability Coefficients 13 items

Alpha = .8863 Standardized item alpha = .8963

Reliability

** Method 2 (covariance matrix) will be used for this analysis **

R E L I A B I L I T Y A N A L Y S I S - S C A L E (A L P H A)

Correlation Matrix

	Q14	Q15	Q16	Q17	Q18
Q14	1.0000				
Q15	.4413	1.0000			
Q16	.1951	.4240	1.0000		
Q17	.2778	.2089	.2845	1.0000	
Q18	-.0336	.0714	.2013	.2034	1.0000
Q19	.1600	.0028	.1629	.1478	.5979

	Q19
Q19	1.0000

N of Cases = 64.0

Reliability Coefficients 6 items

Alpha = .6286 Standardized item alpha = .6327

Reliability

** Method 2 (covariance matrix) will be used for this analysis **

R E L I A B I L I T Y A N A L Y S I S - S C A L E (A L P H A)

Correlation Matrix

	Q20	Q21	Q22	Q23
Q20	1.0000			
Q21	.8113	1.0000		
Q22	.3908	.4085	1.0000	
Q23	.0825	.0131	.1851	1.0000

N of Cases = 64.0

Reliability Coefficients 4 items

Alpha = .6416 Standardized item alpha = .6481

Reliability

** Method 2 (covariance matrix) will be used for this analysis **

R E L I A B I L I T Y A N A L Y S I S - S C A L E (A L P H A)

Correlation Matrix

	Q24	Q25	Q26
Q24	1.0000		
Q25	.6503	1.0000	
Q26	.7290	.8023	1.0000

N of Cases = 63.0

Reliability Coefficients 3 items

Alpha = .8791 Standardized item alpha = .8888

Reliability

** Method 2 (covariance matrix) will be used for this analysis **

R E L I A B I L I T Y A N A L Y S I S - S C A L E (A L P H A)

Correlation Matrix

	Q27	Q28	Q29	Q30	Q31
Q27	1.0000				
Q28	.7410	1.0000			
Q29	.6024	.4959	1.0000		
Q30	.4703	.6080	.6850	1.0000	
Q31	.7167	.4649	.6177	.5621	1.0000
Q32	.3312	.2807	.2223	.3125	.2992
Q33	.4103	.4776	.3681	.4625	.5194

	Q32	Q33
Q32	1.0000	
Q33	.1813	1.0000

N of Cases = 63.0

Reliability Coefficients 7 items

Alpha = .8501 Standardized item alpha = .8603

Reliability

** Method 2 (covariance matrix) will be used for this analysis **

R E L I A B I L I T Y A N A L Y S I S - S C A L E (A L P H A)

Correlation Matrix

	Q34	Q35	Q36	Q37	Q38
Q34	1.0000				
Q35	.2810	1.0000			
Q36	.4869	.1790	1.0000		
Q37	.0464	.1260	.1378	1.0000	
Q38	.3674	.0320	.3635	.3507	1.0000
Q39	.3628	-.0237	.3176	.3634	.3381
Q40	.2056	-.1037	.1331	.1576	.0813

	Q39	Q40
Q39	1.0000	
Q40	.4219	1.0000

N of Cases = 63.0

Reliability Coefficients 7 items

Alpha = .6363 Standardized item alpha = .6641

Reliability

** Method 2 (covariance matrix) will be used for this analysis**

R E L I A B I L I T Y A N A L Y S I S - S C A L E (A L P H A)

Correlation Matrix

	Q41	Q42
Q41	1.0000	
Q42	.6845	1.0000

N of Cases = 62.0

Reliability Coefficients 2 items

Alpha = .8113 Standardized item alpha = .8127